



SELF-GOVERNMENT
IN
INDIA
Vedic & Post-Vedic

W. B. PAYGEE

~~291~~ 3/5

Dhananjayrao Gadgil Library



GIPE-PUNE-000315

Self-Government

IN INDIA.

VEDIC AND POST-VEDIC.

BY

NÂRÂYAN BHAVÂNÂO PÂVGEE.

Retired Resident Magistrate First Class..

1918.

(All Rights Reserved)

Price 3 Rupees.

V 2 : 2 . J

E 8

Printed at the Aryabhushan Press, Poona City,
By Anant Vinayak Patwardhan, and Published
By Nārāyan Bhavānrāo Pāvge,
773 Sadashive Peth,
Poona City.

315

Dedicated

With the Deepest Respects

AND

The Utmost Gratitude

TO

Shree Sad-Guru

Other Published Works of the Author.

(A) IN ENGLISH

Rs. a. p.

I Research-Works.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------|---|---|---|
| 1. The Vedic Fathers of Geology ... | ... | 1 | 4 | 0 |
| 2. The Āryāvartīc Home and its Artīc
Colonies ... | | 3 | 0 | 0 |

(B) IN MARĀTHI

II Historical Works.

Bhāratiya Sāmrajya or Hindu Empire.

In twenty two volumes, of which eleven have already been published, and the rest are in course of publication.

Rs. a. p.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------|---|----|---|
| 1. Āryāvarta or the Aryan Country, its
Physical Features, and Products ... | ... | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| 2. The Aryan people, their prowess and
greatness ... | | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| 3. The Aryan History and Geography ... | ... | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| 4. The Aryan Science and Technical Arts.. | ... | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| 5. The Aryan Institutions—Social, Religious,
Educational, and Political ... | ... | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| 6. The Aryan Home-Life and Morals, Ad-
ventures, Heroism, Commerce, and
Trade ... | | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| 7. The Chief Religions of India ... | ... | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| 8. The Caste-Institutions of India... | ... | 1 | 8 | 0 |
| 9. The Languages of India... | ... | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 10. History of Sanskrit Language & Litera-
ture ... | | 2 | 8 | 0 |
| 11. History of Prakrit and Marathi Lan-
guage and Literature ... | | 2 | 8 | 0 |

III Scientific Works.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------|---|---|---|
| 1. The Science of Language ... | ... | 2 | 8 | 0 |
| 2. The Hindu Drama, as also the Oriental
and Occidental Theatre ... | | 2 | 8 | 0 |

IV Poems.

- | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|---|---|---|
| 1. Recreation of the Mind ... | | 0 | 2 | 0 |
|-------------------------------|--------|---|---|---|

NOW IN THE PRESS.

Historical Work in English.

MARATHA CONQUEBORS—

THE GREAT DELIVERERS FROM FOREIGN YOKE.

Synopsis of Contents.

Subject.	PAGES.
Introduction	i-xxiii
Chapter I. Misunderstanding and Prejudice caused by Ignorance.	1-43
Chapter II. The Vedic Period, and the Marvellous powers in organising Institu- tions.	44-91
Chapter III. The Constitution of the Realm, the Religions Congress, the Popu- lar Assembly, and the Village Commu- nity.	92-136
Chapter IV. Ancient Ind and the King for the people.	137-153
Chapter V. Republican Institutions of India.	154-160
Chapter VI. Tribal Republics, and the King of the People's choice.	161-164
Chapter VII. Chola Emperors, and the Election Rules.	165-176
Chapter VIII. Shivajee's Constitutional Government, and the Ashta-Pradhân System.	177-183
Chapter IX. Malabar Constitutional Mo- narchy.	184-201
Chapter X. Public Opinion, an important Factor in Ind.	202-224
Chapter XI. The Source of the Institu- tions of Ind, and their lasting effects...	225-269

Chapter XII. Our Originality in all the branches of Knowledge, and our present aptitude for Self-Government	...	270-324
Chapter XIII. Ancient Self-Government in the East and the West, compared	...	325-496
Chapter XIV. Our Polity and its lasting effects on Hindu Women	...	497-531
Index	...	533 559
Irrata Et Corrigenda	...	561-562

INTRODUCTION.

Whatever the past *merited claims* of the East and especially of Ind on the West, I must here, at the outset, frankly acknowledge the deep debt of gratitude which the East, at present, owes to the West, on account of the great strides that the former has been able to make, in all the branches of improvement, nay even in various Sciences, in manifold Arts, in material progress, social culture, and moral elevation, consequent on her constant contact with, and the requisite help from, the latter, and especially from England, for which we can never be too grateful.

But, more than this let us not forget another fact of still greater importance; viz. that after innumerable political convulsions, that disturbed Ind for a considerable period, England again established peace in this land of ancient lore, as also of hoary civilization; and her strong hand once more restored *law and order*, which, however, before* the advent of the Islam rule in this country, we had almost continuously enjoyed, (*vide infra p 493 et seque*). These, therefore

* This is borne out by the fact that there was profound peace in Ind during the Vedic and post-Vedic period, as will be seen from the extensive Vedic and Post-Vedic Literature of inestimable worth (*vide infra pp 13, 14, 35, 52 Foot-note*), which the country could only secure under peaceful conditions and the tranquil state of the land. To this period, the great kings—Sudâs, Divodâs, Yayâti, Harischandra, &c., of Vedic fame belong; while the Râmâyana and the Mahâ-Bhârata Eras claim the most renowned King-Emperors.

having been brought about at a time, when, as a matter of fact, they were most needed, we—the children of the soil—do, and shall, ever remember the fact with feelings of warm appreciation, and deep gratitude.

This has naturally tended to engender *mutual sympathy*, create *respect for each other*, bridge over the wide gulf of separation, and thus appreciably soften or even greatly reduce the tension, which once existed between the Orientals and the Occidentals.

However, there still exists prodigious ignorance and *deep-rooted prejudice* in the West, as regards the East, in respect of many questions of great magnitude (*vide infra p 482 et Sequæ*, Chapters x, xii, &c.), and especially in the matter of the most ancient civilization¹ of Ind, her peculiar

1 (a) I may here state that, our Hindu or rather our Indo-Aryan civilization is the oldest. For, it is *older than* that of China. Nay, it is even *older than* that of Egypt, Babylon and Chaldea, Syria and Assyria, Persia and Carthage, Greece and Rome, or any other ancient nation on Earth. (*vide infra pp 348, 528* Foot-note, proving our influence and *Colonics* in China).

(b) Now, as regards China, Dr. Haug says as follows:—

“ Thus, we obtain for the bulk of the *Sambhita* of the *Rig-Veda* the space, from 1400–2000 (B. C.); the oldest hymns and sacrificial formulas may be a few hundred years more ancient still, so that we would fix the very commencement of Vedic Literature between 2400–2000 B. C. (*Vide Ait. Br. By Dr Haug. Introduction. pp 47–48. Ed. 1863*).

(c) But, really speaking, our *Rig-Vedic antiquity* goes yet further, nay as far back as even the Tertiary period, as

polity, her Village communities (समिति), her Popular Assemblies (सभा), her Religious Congress

will be seen from Chapter xvi of my Work.—*The Aryâvartic Home and Its Arctic Colonies*. While, the antiquity of China and her literature does not carry us back beyond 2200 B. C. For, says Haug, "If we consider the completely authenticated antiquity of several of the sacred books of the Chinese, such as the original documents, of which the Shu—King, or Book of History, is composed, and the antiquity of sacrificial songs of the Shi—King, which all carry us back to 1700-2200 B. C., it will certainly not be surprising that we assign a similar antiquity to the most ancient parts of the Vedas. For, there is nowhere any reason to show, that the Vedas must be less ancient than the earliest parts of the sacred books of the Chinese, but there is on the contrary much ground to believe, that they can fully lay claim to the same antiquity". (*vide* Ait. Br. By Dr. Haug. Introduction. p 48. Ed. 1863; and *infra* p 328 F. N. I, proving our influence and Colonies in China).

(d) Here, by the bye, in view of vindicating the very great, nay, the *greatest* antiquity of our Rig-Veda and its civilization, I beg to quote Professor Bloomfield, who, while noticing Mr. Tilak's *Orion*, observed as under:—....."The language and literature of the Vedas is, by no means, so primitive as to place with it the real beginnings of Aryan life"....."These in all probability and in all due moderation reach back thousands of years more". He even further added that, it was for this reason, "needless to point out that this curtain, which seems to shut off our vision at 4500 B C., may prove in the end a veil of thin gauze". (Eighteenth Anniversary Address. John Hopkins University).

(e) Moreover, as to India's antiquity and her civilization, exceeding that of all ancient nations, M. Louis Jacolliot—a French *Savant* and Antiquarian—says, "Manou (मनु) inspired Egyptian, Hebrew, Greek, and Roman legislation, and his spirit still pervades the whole economy of our European laws". (Preface, p viii).

(विद्य), her *Representative Institutions*, her *Republican States*, and her fascinating *Constitutional Government*, that went so far back as the Mediæval Ages, nay the Buddhist period, and even the hoary times of the Rigveda. I have called the VEDIC POLITY and the ANCIENT GOVERNMENT of

(f) The French *Savant* has also endeavoured to prove that Moses had only confined himself "to copying with modifications, the constitution of Hindoo emigrations and colonization, honoured in Egypt and throughout Asia". p 119. (*vide* La Bible Dans L'Inde. Edition 1870).

(g) While Thornton, the Historian of India, says, as regards the great antiquity of Indian civilization : " Ere yet the Pyramids looked down upon the valley of the Nile,—when Greece and Italy, those cradles of modern civilization, housed only the tenants of the wilderness, India was the seat of wealth and grandeur ". (Vol. i. p 2 ; *infra* p 497. Foot-note).

(h) Besides, Count Bjornstjerna says the same, in respect of the antiquity of the Hindus or Indo-Aryans, with still greater force, in his "Theogony of the Hindus". (*vide* *infra* p 276. Foot-note).

(i) And, obviously, it was owing to all the aforesaid cogent arguments and other available evidence, that Mr. Halbed exclaimed with deep reverence. after discussing the four Yugas of the Hindus, as indicated in the sequel. (p 276. Foot-note).

(j) I may here add that, I have proved by Geological evidence, the great antiquity of Man and his having been of the *Tertiary Period*, in my work "The Vedic Fathers of Geology." (pp 5, 6, 32, 33, and Chapter V). While, in my work "The Âryāvartīc Home and Its Arctic Colonies," I have, endeavoured to show our *Aryan Civilization* of the *Tertiary Period* (pp 470 @ 479). Nay, the pre-Glacial emigrations from Âryāvarta of the Rig-Vedic man, as also his colonization of the Arctic Regions, not to speak of his interesting observations made therein, evince the same thing. (*vide* *infra* p 205. Foot-note b, in connection with this),

- ▼

Ind *fascinating*, because it exhibits to us, as shown in the sequel (*pp* 377-384), the various forms of Government as also the irresistible power of having exercised its beneficial influence on the Indian mind, and thus made it last long, by its *tenacity* and *heredity*.

It would, therefore, not be out of place, at this stage, to make only a passing reference to the very important, and doubtless genuine sources of information, which we have utilized, and of which requisite details would be found in Chapters ii-xi of this work, in respect of our ancient *Self-Government* as well as our *Elective Franchise*. These sources are obviously five-fold :

- (a) Archæological,
- (b) Numismatical,
- (c) Epigraphical,
- (d) Historical, and
- (e) Vedic.

Despite vandalism which has done incalculable mischief, nay caused terrible havock in India, and ruthlessly destroyed our innumerable, not to say inestimable works of Art as also of Science, and other invaluable Literature, (*vide* Vincent Smiths' Early History of India. 2nd Ed. *pp.* 294, 295, and Tod's Rajastnan. Vol. I. *pp.* viii, ix, xiv, 217. Third Reprint), there is yet ample material left, which, if systematically exploited would certainly yield excellent results. The Archæological and Numismatical materials, however, seem to be scanty ; and it is only the Epigraphical matter that has so far given historical

facts,—facts which even when subjected to historical criticism, have yielded abundant, and yet most valuable and extremely satisfactory evidence, as regards our *old traditions of Self-Government and elective franchise*.

The Research-work and other historical sources are certainly of great value, while the Vedic source, above all, is not only of hoary antiquity, but has moreover, been declared by even Western Oriental* scholars of note, well versed in the knowledge of historical criticism, to be *historical, inaccessible to foreign tributaries*, and to have *continued fuller, purer, and truer to its original character*. As such, therefore, it is doubtless of inestimable value, and simply matchless. (*vide infra pp. 12, 23, 52 Foot-notes, 87, 129, 130, 297, 527, Foot-notes, 443-465*).

These, therefore, I have ventured to utilise in the sequel, without unnecessarily encumbering the volume, especially that portion which relates to the Uttar Mallur (उत्तरमल्लुर), Tanjore (तंजावर), and Ukkal (उकल) Inscriptions, of which the particulars have appeared in the Annual Reports of the Archæological Survey of India, 1904-05, G. O., &c, of the Government of Madras—Nos. 922, 923, dated 19th August 1899. (*vide infra pp. 16, and 165-176*). All these, I need hardly say, were

* (a) Max-Muller. See Rig-Veda. Vol. iv. p lxxi; History of Ancient Sanscrit Literature. Ed. 1859. p 63; and India. What Can it Teach us ? Ed. 1883. p 21.

(b) Dr. Rudolf Roth. *Vide* the volume of the German Oriental Society for 1848. p 216.

and have been accessible to the Public, and as such, open to all, for scrutiny or investigation, for study or information.

And yet, I may at this stage take the liberty to state that, owing to predisposition and ignorance, not to say even on account of their having been fed exclusively on Greek, Roman, and Jewish literature (*vide infra pp. 34, 35*), many European writers known to fame, have been inclined to think like the German philosopher Goethe,* that "Chinese, Indian§, and Egyptian antiquities are never more than curiosities." But, this dictum cannot now, in the least command assent, in the present state of our knowledge, nay of the great Researches in Sanskrit Literature, Indian Epigraphy, and Numismatics; especially, when European languages, literature, art, and philosophy, have been proved to be materially connected with those of India by innumerable bonds, a thing admitted also by historian Vincent Smith, in his "Early History of India." (*p 2. Edition 1908*).

Now, every student of history will have to admit the fact, noticed by a recent Indian author, Mr. C. N. K. Aiyar, M. A. L. T., that, "India suffers to-day in the estimation of the world, more through that world's ignorance of the achievements of the heroes of Indian history, than through the absence or the insignificance of such achievements". (*Vide Life and Times of Shree*

* Vide "The Maxims and Reflections of Goethe", in Bailey Saunder's translation. § *Vide infra pp 348, 528.*

Shankarāchārya. p 5. Fourth Edition). And it is certainly no small satisfaction to find even Vincent Smith—the historian—fully endorsing the statement of Mr. Aiyar, nay also holding it to be a just observation, and adding further that, “the men of old time in India did deeds worthy of remembrance, and deserving of rescue from the oblivion, in which they have been buried for so many centuries.” Early History of India. p 3. Edition 1908).

In the circumstances it is but natural that Ind or ancient Bhārata Varsha, better known during the *Vedic period as the Land of the Seven Rivers, should be proud of her claims to originality in having given birth, first and before all, to ideas of Self-Government*, nay even to ideas in respect of not only *Constitutional Government*, but also in respect of other forms of Government, and of Government based on the matter-of-fact *popular Representation*, which, as will be shown in the sequel, seems to have received, from our ancestors, greater attention and higher regard from all stand-points, as years rolled on. (*vide infra pp. 273, 376-384*). The crude ideas and forms of Government had gradually grown and blossomed into *Public Institutions* like the Vedic Religious Congress (विद्य), *Popular Assembly* (सभा), and the *Village Community* or Commune (समिति), the Proto-types perhaps of subsequent democratic institutions in Europe, or of “the Houses of Parliament in England, though admittedly on a smaller scale. (*vide infra pp 156, 157, 192, 195, Chapters ii—ix, and pp 377, 443-465*).

Here, perhaps, the Reader will not be inclined to believe me, or repose any credence in what I have stated, suspecting the same to be embellished or exaggerated. Let me, however, assure him, that I shall, as observed by Mallinātha², our great Sanskrit commentator, endeavour to state nothing *that is not warranted by facts*, nor anything that is not fortified by evidence. In brief, it would be sufficient here to state that our *Self-Governing Popular Assembly* (सभा) and the *Village Community* (समिति) of the Vedic Epoch (*infra pp 93-136, 273*), our *Republican Institutions* of pre-Buddhistic and the Buddhistic Eras (*pp 137-164*), our *Constitutional Monarchy* of Vedic and pre-Vedic times (*pp 98, 99*), and even our *Representative Government* of Ancient and Medieval period (*pp 22, 47, 48, 125-140, 142 et seque*), have certainly been proved facts and admitted truths.

Besides, Politics has been described in our ancient Epics and other great works, whether religious, social, or historical, as *the very head and front* of every thing. As such, therefore, it had, from very early ages, rightly attracted the attention it deserved of our great Ancestors. Nay, even the popular Assembly (सभा) and the *Village Commune* (समिति) were considered to be of divine origin. As, however, I have given the requisite details below, for information of the Reader, I need not dwell on them here. (*vide infra pp 127, 128, 246-249*).

2. नामूलं लिख्यते किञ्चिन्नानपेक्षितमुच्यते ॥ (खुवंशकाव्ये मल्लिनाथोक्तिः).

But, apart from this, which tells its own tale, in respect of the *democratic* and *republican* Institutions of Ind, I may here, in brief, venture to observe that, even in modern times, so far back as A. D. 1746, we see the Honourable East India Company's English Representative at Calicut, actually designating the *Nayar's Assembly* a "Parliament," on account of its *representative character*. In like manner, even Mr. Logan,³ the Collector of Malabar District, writes as follows, in respect of this matter :—"The Nad or County was a congeries of taras or *Village Republics*, and the Kuttam or the Assembly of the *Nád* or County, was a *Representative body of immense power*, which, when necessity existed, set at naught the authority of the Rājā, and punished his ministers, *when they did unwarrantable acts*." The Honourable Company's Representative also remarks thus :—"These Nāyars, being heads of the Calicut people, *resemble the Parliament*,⁴ and do not obey the King's dictates in all things, but chastise⁵ his ministers, when they do unwarrantable acts." (*vide* Tellicherry Factory-Diary of 28th May 1746).

Mr. Logan, speaking of the Nāyars' *Self-Government* and their all-powerful influence during olden times, writes thus again :—"This bulwark against the tyranny and oppression of their own rulers secured for the country a high state of

³ *Vide* The Malabar Gazetteer " Vol I. Edition 1887. pp 88,89.

⁴ The *Italics* in the above quotation are mine. (*The Author.*)

⁵ *Vide* Malabar Gazetteer. Vol I. Edition 1887. p 89.

happiness and peace ; and if foreign peoples and foreign influences had not intervened, it might, with almost literal truth, have been said of the Malayalis that, happy is the people who have no history " (*Malabar Gazetteer*. Preface. Vol I. p iv, Edition 1887).

Moreover, in connection with our system of *Self-Government* and even of *Representation*, it would, I beleive, not be out of place to offer the testimony of Mr. Anstey, a scholar of vast erudition, varied culture, and ripe judgment. I, therefore, invite the attention of the Reader to the remarks made by the scholar in respect of the matter. (*Vide infra pp 22, 23*).

Thus, having had due regard to (a) the oldest Rig-Vedic evidence, its past traditions, and the latest Post-Vedic testimony in respect of our *very ancient Constitutional and Representative Government* in the Land of the Seven Rivers, as also to (b) the most valuable record that relates to *Self-Governed Republics* of Buddhistic times, nay even to (c) historical facts of pre-eminence, bearing on the subject of *Self-Government and Representative Bodies*, during the period of the indigenous Paramount Sovereigns of Northern India, of *Mahā-Rāshtra*, as well as of Southern India, and especially to (d) the Village-Communities of our country, that really present to the world the so-called sheet-anchor of our indigenous *Self-Government*, there absolutely remains no doubt whatever, that Ind had enjoyed, under her own indigenous Rulers, *Self-Government, Constitutional sway, and even Government by Representation*, almost continu-

ously, till, within her own borders and on her own sacred soil, the appearance of foreign influences and foreign invasions, had slowly but steadily ruined them all, leaving here and there but indestructible remnants of *the Village Communities* (*vide supra p v, infra pp 19, 20, 264 Foot-note*).

Evidently, the idea of Self-Government had its *source* and *origin* in this very *Land of the Seven Rivers*; and *the plant has certainly been indigenous here, and not at all exotic*, nor in any way foreign to the soil. Accordingly, I desire to give a brief yet connected history of it, in the present volume, from the Rig-Vedic times down to the present century, in view of removing all ignorance, and setting at rest every doubt that exists, in respect of the subject.

For, barring honourable exceptions, in respect of which we cannot ever speak too highly, nor too gratefully, the ever favourite theme of the West appears to be, that the East, or to come nearer home, Ind never knew before, what Self-Government was, and that, therefore, she is not *even now fit for it*. Probably, this has been supposed by some Westerners to be the most melodious chord on which to harp, in season and out of season, for respite and recreation, not to say for political ends as well. Or, as Dr. Dādābhai Nowroji would put it, ‘exhibition of the want of capacity of the Indians in the matter of Self-Government, is but another favourite argument of some Anglo-Indians; and it is the old trick of the tyrant not to give you the opportunity of fair trial, and condemn you off-hand as incapable.’ (*vide infra p 480*).

Besides, many Westerners speak and maintain with an air of superiority, but without the least foundation, nay without the slightest and the remotest proof, that Orientals were *quite innocent of Self-Government*, and that they had no conception of it at all, until western thought and western culture, western contact and western communication, western light and western civilization introduced it in the East, and made them conversant with the ideas of the West in respect thereof.

Obviously, this has become a supremely hackneyed yet favourite theme ; and even great politicians, statesmen of the foremost rank in Europe, and eminent writers dwell on it with some animadversion, and thereby declare⁶ to the world that,

6. (a) For instance, during the discussion in the House of Commons on the Egyption question, that ensued on the 14th of June 1910, Mr. Balfour, the then Premier of England, has been reported to have said as follows :—No Oriental nation had ever shown any trace of capacity for Self-Government.

(b) In like manner, Lord Ronaldshay, now Governor of Bengal, who was for some time the A. D. C. to Lord Curzon during his Viceroyalty, who must have read much of the Political Institutions of India, who had, moreover, all the available means to know these, if only he had wished to do so, and who could have easily picked out the requisite information from the valuable Reports of the Archaeological Survey of India, or from Ukka! Inscriptions of Southern India printed therein, appears to have observed in his speeches and writings that, a certain section of the Indian peoples is imbued with an unnatural desire for a reform of Government, for which they have no aptitude either by instinct, or by tradition. *Vide* Modern Review for April 1917 ; Maratha (10-12-1916). How deep this ignorance !

no nation of the Orient had ever shown any trace of capacity for *Self-Government*. But, as a matter of fact, there is, doubtless, chapter and verse, nay

How deplorable this want of knowledge about India, even when Lord Ronaldshay could have conveniently laid his hands on the stout Volumes published by Government, as these clearly showed the knowledge of, and great regard for, *Self-Government* in Ancient India !! *Vide supra pp vi-xii.*

(c) Moreover, Lord Sydenham, the Ex-Governor of Bombay, has also, owing to ignorance, gone the length of saying that, "In India,.....even the elements of democracy are non-existent".....(*Vide The Nineteenth Century And After*. December, 1916. p 1122). The Reader, I think, is aware that Lord Sydenham was Governor of Bombay for full five years, and if he had the mind to utilise the Government sources of information in respect of *Self-Government* and *Representative Institutions* in Ancient India, shown above, he would not have made the aforesaid ignorant assertion.

(d) In like manner, Mr. Lloyd George, in his speech at Carnarvon, on 3rd February 1917, had referred with approval to "the doctrine that the Turk is incapable of governing any other race justly, and even his own race well." (*Vide India* of February 9, 1917. p 57).

(e) And last but not least, a Western writer of acknowledged authority has declared us.—Indians, unfit for *Self-Government*. (*Vide Encyclopaedia Britannica*. XI. 20).

Nay, he has even ranked us with the savage aborigines of Figi Islands, and written with evident pride and pleasure, about the self-governing qualities of his own race and communities; though, by doing so, he has only betrayed his utter ignorance of the East, and especially of Ind and her hoary civilization. (*Vide supra pp ii-iv, and infra p 385*).

(f) It may be noted here, by the bye, that notwithstanding our having been thus ranked with the savage aborigines of the Figi Islands, even Lord Macaulay, who is in

an enormous mass of evidence to prove, that quite the contrary has really been the case. This, therefore, I have endeavoured to establish in the sequel,

noway an admirer of the Hindus, has had to admit the fact of the people of India having been "quite as highly civilised as the victorious Spaniards. They had reared cities larger and fairer than Saragossa or Toledo, and buildings more beautiful and costly than the Cathedral of Seville. They could show bankers richer than the richest firms of Barcelona or Cadiz, viceroys whose splendour far surpassed that of Ferdinand the Catholic, myriads of cavalry and long trains of artillery, which would have astonished the great captain" (vide Macaulay's Lord Clive. Longman's Edition, 1877. p 497).

(g) Besides, it is still more worthy of note that, while on the one hand, deliberate attempts have been made to dub us unfit for *Self-Government*, on the other hand, even those statesmen at the helm, who are responsible in every way for the Government of the British Empire, unhesitatingly declare us (Hindus) *capable of Government* (vide infra p 484). Moreover, Mr. Anstey says that India's Local Self-Government and the system of Representation are as old as the East itself (see below pp 22,23). Nay, Dr.

ir, W. W. Hunter has declared us to be "the *Ruling* power in a country not by force of arms, but by the vigour of hereditary culture and temperance" (infra p 25); and Sir Henry Maine and others have thought our Village Communities to be little Republics, independent, self-acting, organised, and representative. (infra pp 22,23,96,97,98).

(h) Above all, Mrs. Annie Besant has, "fearlessly" placed a book of 760 pages, entitled "How India wrought for Freedom," before the Public, "as a proof of India's fitness for Home Rule," telling every one to "Read the Penal laws against Roman Catholics in Ireland, and ask if the English, who enacted and enforced them were fit for Self-Government. See the misery and starvation of France in the eighteenth century ending in the Revolution, review

with the requisite proof which I could lay my hands upon. As in the case of our ancient *Self-Government*, much ignorance prevails in the West, so also does it prevail in respect of the influence of Public Opinion in India, which, by the by, we have always supposed, in the very nature of things, to be an *all-powerful factor* in this country, as will be seen later on. In fact, it has been an indigenens *plant* in the land, and *not* at all *exotic*. Nay, it has been the real source of *Self-Government*, and has, moreover, been of material importance in assisting it to last where nothing else has lasted. I have, therefore, thought it desirable to devote a separate Chapter to the consideration of the subject, for removing the erroneous impression that had already gained ground in the foreign heart that there was absolutely nothing like Public Opinion in the East ; that as such, the Orientals never knew what Public Opinion was ; that they were not aware that, Public Opinion was but a great power and a marvellous force ; that it was only the Occidentals that had any idea about it at all in the West, who, therefore, having been the *Pioneers of the movement*, have been able to

the Peasant's War in Germany, the constant Wars in Italy, the turbulence of Hungary and Poland, the royal murders and revolutions in England, and say if all these countries were more fit for Self-Government than India. Yet, they, unworthy, took it, and have purified themselves by it, becoming more fit in the using of it. India, more worthy than they to take it, is deemed unfit. The only argument against India's fitness is her submission." (Vide the Foreword in the Book of Mrs. Annie Besant, referred to above ; and *infra* pp 295-300).

show to the East such splendid results thereof, as have been at present perceived, by properly utilising the force to its fullest extent.

Now, speaking of the ever-powerful *Public Opinion* in India, which, doubtless, as I have shown later on (*vide infra pp 202 @ 224*), has been as much respected, appreciated, and deemed valuable in India as in England, it is certainly very amusing not to say ridiculous to see, how some Westerners steeped in inveterate prejudice and deep ignorance about India, apply different measures to connote the quality or denote the meaning of Public Opinion, in respect of the people of India, as distinguished from those of England. And it naturally becomes extremely painful to observe, how fanciful, nay even absurd arguments have been advanced, and how great endeavours have been made *in right earnest*, even by those who consider themselves elite, erudite, veracious, and civilized, to explain to the world that, some words and expressions, viz. *public opinion, the love of liberty, the influence of the Press*, have varied and peculiar meanings — *one* in India, and *another* in England —, or, different meanings in India and in England, and that, *the same words and expressions stand for very different things at different places, and in different communities.*

This will certainly appear ludicrous, nay even unnatural, and will doubtless sound strange to all. But, I may safely say without the least fear of contradiction, that the statement is neither a fiction nor a fable, nor for the matter of that a concocted thing. But, it is a fact, and we have it in

the positive yet altogether ridiculous assertion of Lord Macaulay himself. Says he : " The political phraseology of the English in India is the same with the political phraseology of our countrymen at home ; but it is never to be forgotten that the same words stand for very different things at London and at Calcutta. We hear much about public opinion, the love of liberty, the influence of the Press. But, we must remember that public opinion means the opinion of five hundred persons who have no interest, feeling, or taste in common with the fifty millions among whom they live ; that the love of liberty means the strong objection which the five hundred feel to every measure which can prevent them from acting as they choose towards the fifty millions ; that the Press is altogether supported by the five hundred, and has no motive to plead the cause of the fifty millions." (*Vide* " The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay.

7. All this forcibly recalls to our mind the observations of the Honorable Mr. D.E. Wacha, in respect of matters of this sort, or of a kindred nature. Says he : " It is notorious that there is a school of Anglo-Indian writers on Indian history, whose vocation seems primarily to deprecate, if not altogether run down, all that is valuable politically, socially, and morally, in the India of the period antecedent to British rule, rather than give a faithful portraiture ; and secondly, to persist in relating the history itself in a distorted fashion, in face of well-known facts, and pervert an impartial judgment by a dissertation on motives, which existed in their own imagination."

(*Vide* the Introduction written by the Honorable Mr. D. E. Wacha, to the Volume of Miscellaneous Writings of the late Honourable Mr. Justice M. G. Ranade, p ii. Edition 1915.)

By his nephew, the Right Honourable Sir George Otto Trevelyan. Bart. M. P. Popular Edition. 1893. p 257).

Asseverations^s of this kind had they been true, or prejudiced statements like these, had they been just, would have hardly provoked any indignation or evoked surprise, and could have little induced this humble Self, to write or speak in defence of *the oldest Political Institutions* of Ind, or of *the latent force of Public Opinion* that has been in existence in the Land of the Seven Rivers, from her hoary antiquity, and even before other ancient nations had yet raised their heads (*supra pp ii-iv, infra pp 101,348,497*). But, when it has actually been perceived, that not only the ignorant masses, but also the elite and the refined in manners, the erudite and the highly civilized, nay, even well read and the *foremost politicians*, barring eminent exceptions, pronounce authoritatively, and yet without an iota of evidence, that the *Orient* never knew, before her contact with the West, what *Self-Government* or *Public Opinion* was; when it is observed, that even the most distinguished statesmen show such prodigious ignorance of the East and of hoary Ind; that even the learned, excepting a few, are not inclined to dive deep into the *past* and its real sources of information,—sources which, as will be shown in the sequel, have been *as pure as crystal*, and have not, in the least, been contaminated, tampered with, or made corrupt and impure (*Vide infra pp 129,130,52 foot-notes*); that no one, except only a few,

8. *Vide Supra pp xiii-xviii, infra Chapters ii-X.*

would go even below the surface, to see for himself, how really the facts stand ; and that even those, who emphatically claim the epithet of *veracious*, make statements quite the reverse of truth, or show an undesirable attitude in passing sweeping condemnations on the Orient, *even* while they, as a matter of fact, stand face to face with tangible evidences in respect of the grandeur of Ind, of her Self-Government, of her Elective franchise, of her great Institutions—Political, Social, Religious, Moral, Educational,—of her past gigantic intellectual achievements, of the wonderful acumen and deep penetration of the *Sons of the soil*, as also the very *rare talents of her gifted few* ; and when lastly, it is noticed that during this process of wholesale condemnation, not the slightest endeavour was ever made by those who have condemned us, to open up *the* invaluable *Vedic Mines*, or explore *the fathomless deep* of our ancient Sanskrit Literature, for the sake of getting genuine information as regards the nature of our Vedic and Post-Vedic polity, our Political Institutions, our administration of olden times, as also the various forms of Government prevalent in Ancient India ; then, certainly, it is humbly deemed to be time for an unpretentious attempt to vindicate the *prior* and *legitimate* claims of Ind, in respect of her most ancient Self-Government, and even of her past and present capacity, or aptitude for Self-Government, by raising our voice, howsoever feeble and humble, howsoever solitary for the moment, in the *just cause* of this most ancient country and its hoary civilization, with

fervent hopes that true representation of facts will never be considered to be a forbidden game.

In view, therefore, of throwing, on this most important and yet greatly neglected subject, some side-lights from the great world Torch, the Rig-Veda and other Vedic and Post-Vedic Literature, I have ventured, in the following pages, to give a short yet connected and consistent History of the Vedic and Post-Vedic Polity, its *Representative Character*, and the Brāhmanic Constitutional Monarchy, that seems to have been moulded by the indigenous influence of the Political Institutions of Bhāratavarsha.

I have also endeavoured to show further, in a separate chapter, how remarkable has been the influence and how great the weight, which *Public Opinion in Ind* has ever been exercising from the Vedic times, not only here and there, but throughout this extensive continent of India, on her people and her society at large, on her various institutions scattered over the vast country, and even on the *sovereigns* of the times ; which, therefore, secured some sort of *constitution* and *representation*, though not in a perfect form, nor even in such forms as we see in the West at present, and thus *moulded* the actions of the persons in power.

Here, by the bye, I may be permitted to state that, I have nowhere indulged, in the least, in fiction, and have, therefore, as a mere narrator of bare facts, only ventured to do what I could, in the investigation of matters that required close scrutiny. In short, I have humbly claimed the

privilege of looking into the available genuine sources of information or other evidence, and have also conscientiously done the duty of sifting it according to the rules of historical criticism, and the accepted notions in respect thereof, howsoever feeble my pen, howsoever humble the attempt, especially as I conceive that the sacred object in performing the duty is to.....“Nothing extenuate. Nor aught set down in malice.”

Or, to quote Goethe :—“The historian’s duty is to separate the true from the false, the certain from the uncertain, and the doubtful from that which cannot be accepted.....Every investigator must, before all things, look upon himself as one who is summoned to serve on a jury. He has only to consider how far the statement of the case is complete, and clearly set forth by the evidence. Then, he draws his conclusion and gives his vote, whether it be, that his opinion coincides with that of the foreman or not.” (*The Maxims and Reflections* of Goethe).

Naturally, therefore, I am not without diffidence in respect of the work that I have undertaken, though it be from pure love of labour. However, I hope that this will, by exhibiting the other side of the shield, remove, partially at any rate, if not completely, the prodigious ignorance and the consequent inveterate prejudice of the West, about ancient Ind and her peoples, her former *Self-Government* and her autonomous administration, her hoary civilization and her wide influence on the world, beyond Bhārata Varsha. (See *infra* pp 528, 529).

And here, I believe, it would not be out of place at this stage to state that, to shape the whole future is not our problem. But, the all-ruling Heaven willing, it is just possible for us to do what we ought to do. Obviously, the general issue, as is always the case, will ever rest with that Highest Intelligence, who is *Omniscient, Omnipotent, and Omnipresent.*

Lastly, I would here further respectfully observe that, the one great thing or even an essential precept, underlying all successful literary efforts, is, I humbly think, to look into our heart, to be fearless, and to be ever true to our Conscience, nay be always loyal to the promptings of our own soul. In this way, and by these means alone,

"If we can only brave the storm,
Or do the painful duty,
The clouds will break, the light will Come,
And fill the world with beauty."

All these facts having emboldened me to write and complete the work, I have ventured to deliver it to the candour and curiosity of the Public.

POONA
January 1918. }

N. B. Pavgee.

THE
Vedic & Post-Vedic Fabric
OF
REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT
IN
Bhārata-Varsha.
AND

The Brahmanic Constitutional Monarchy.

Chapter I.

MISUNDERSTANDING AND
PREJUDICE CAUSED BY
IGNORANCE.

Owing to much misunderstanding and immense prejudice caused by deep ignorance, not to say deplorable want of knowledge, in respect of the East, the West has some-times been found to be in the habit of monopolizing to itself all that is good, and every thing that is wise or sensible. And although, *unprejudiced and impartial History* has an *altogether different tale to tell*, has even *stern things* and *solemn truths* to state, perhaps *unpalatable to many*, nay has *undreamed of realities* and *hard yet accomplished facts*

to declare, *from her austere seat of calm judgment*, still, many a learned man of the West, as also men of lead and light, and some statesmen known to fame, make absolutely injudicious statements,—injudicious because they are unwise as also far from truth,—and even venture to affirm, in season and out of season, that the East is all darkness, that the Orient is only the hot-bed of barbarians and savages, and that it is simply the habitat of denizens akin only to beasts or negroes. (*Vide India. What can it teach us? pp 34-38, 42-44, 58, 75. Edition 1883.*)

This may, no doubt, sound strange, But, there is not an iota of exaggeration in the statement, and it is as true as the night follows the day. For, even Sir Walter Scott has expressed, in bold relief, the prevailing sentiment of race-prejudice, in "*St. Ronan's Well*," by putting it into the mouth of Captain MacTurk, where he says:—"Compare my own self with a parcel of black heathen bodies and natives, that never were in the inner side of a kirk whilst they lived, but go about worshipping stocks and stones, and swinging themselves upon bamboos, like peasts, as they are"! (*Vide Sir Henry Cotton's New India, Edition 1904. pp. 36, 37.*)

Moreover, the evidence of another English gentleman of England will also go to prove the degree of contempt exhibited by the Westerners

in general, for the Orientals, when he admits it to be "the brutal assumption of the English vulgar, that there is little to choose between the Indian and the negro." (*Vide* Sir Henry Maine's *Village Communities*, p. 215. New Edition. 1890). This sort of extreme scorn and such debased notions would provoke any one who has any sense of honour, as also respect for the Hindus and the Hindu nation, that once stood at the top of all, dictated terms to all, and gave lessons to the world. (*Vide* the Code of Manu II. 20, and M. Louis Jacolliot's *La Bible Dans L' Inde*, in which he says, "Manu inspired Egyptian, Hebrew, Greek, and Roman legislation, and his spirit still permeates the whole economy of our European laws." Preface, p. VIII. Edition 1870). See also Maine. Do. p 15. *Infra* p 12.

It was therefore no wonder, if Max Muller was grieved to see the feeling of contempt so rampant in Europe, when he expressed disappointment and regret in the course of lectures delivered to the candidates for the Indian Civil Service, by observing that, "I believe there is nothing more disheartening to any high-minded young man than the idea that he will have to spend his life among human beings whom he can never respect or love—natives as they are called, not to use more offensive names—men whom he is taught to consider as not amenable

to the recognised principles of self-respect, uprightness, and veracity, and with whom therefore any community of interests and action, much more any real friendship, is supposed to be out of the question". (India. What can it teach us ? p 35; Ed. 1883).

But, this is not all. And I herewith produce the testimony of a reputed historian—Colonel Todd—and quote his very words from the "Annals of Rajasthan," where he writes, "A contempt for all that is Asiatic too often marks our country-men in the East." (Vol. I, pp 117-118, Ed. 1880).

This, perhaps, is an inherent attitude of some Westerners in respect of the East, not to say in respect of all the coloured races. And Mr. Bryce has even gone the length of saying, "It needs something more than the virtue of a philosopher, it needs the tenderness of a saint to preserve the same courtesy and respect towards the members of a backward race, as are naturally extended to equals." (Romanes Lecture delivered at Oxford in 1902). *Vide* also Sir H. Cotton's "New India," pp 37, 38, 40, Edition 1904.

There is, moreover, the deep rooted prejudice against the dark skin ; and barring honourable exceptions which are the brightest gems that adorn their country, the average Westerner

makes no secret of it. For, he observes, with evident pride and pleasure, nay with complacency and even self-satisfaction, that "I cannot stand these natives ; I think they are such rank outsiders". (*Vide* Sir Henry Cotton's *New India*, p 38, Ed. 1904).

And the contempt caused by ignorance and prejudice appears to have been so wide-spread, and to such an extent and pitch, that even a late Lieutenant Governor of Bengal has been reported to have observed as follows :—"The Indians teach us ? Absurd ! Why, they know nothing ; we have not taught them. The natives teach us " ! (*Vide* "*Prosperous British India*". By Wm. Digby, p 55, Ed. 1901).

But, more than this, even a high personage of the rank of a Governor General of India seems, owing simply to ignorance and bias, never to have hesitated to express his contempt even for a ruling Indian Prince, in a language, which, we, at any rate, nay all men of good culture, think to be highly objectionable. I quote, herein-below, an extract from the speeches of the Honourable John Bright, M. P., to enable the Reader to form a correct idea of the degree of contempt which the West generally entertains for the East. Since, writes the Right Honourable Mr. John Bright, as follows :—

"Only think of a Governor General of India writing to an Indian Prince, the ruler over many millions of men in the heart of India. 'Remember, you are but as the dust of my feet.' Passages like these are left out of despatches when laid on the table of the House of Commons. It would not do for the Parliament, or the Crown, or the people of England to know that their officer addressed language like this to a Native Prince." (*Vide* John Bright's Speeches, Edited by J. E. T. Rogers, 1892, p. 24).

Probably, the residence of the whites in the East tends to develop their sentiment of intolerance and *the supposed* race-superiority, while the intense spirit of *self-approbation* becomes naturally *rampant* in them, as there is absolutely nothing to utterly get rid of it, nay even to check it.

Obviously, therefore, the root of the matter lies not in the caste differences. But, it owes its origin to *the deep ignorance* of the attainments of the people of India, to *the prejudices* of the ruling race, to *the want* of sympathy for the ruled, and chiefly to *the arrogant attitude* of some whites, while they are in contact with the coloured people, although the fact is on record that, the Hindoos are *remarkably good in their nature*, and show some of the *finest qualities of head and heart*, as admitted by all.

For, even Mr. H. M. Hyndman admits that, "All Englishmen, who have known Hindus, and who have studied the people of India, have admired and liked them, and have considered them a very superior people. They are a race to be admired ; yet the English papers treat them with contempt. You can scarcely read an article in an English capitalist news-paper that does not speak of the Indian peoples with contempt." (The Unrest in India, 1907. p 14.)

But, to return to another instance of the kind, where inveterate bias itself would *blush* for all the awkward and silly things it has been pleased to utter owing simply to gross ignorance of facts, want of even a slight knowledge of Oriental Literature, and pre-concieved notions in favour of every thing European, or Occidental. For, Lord Macaulay having branded Sanskrit as worthless, has, moreover, in respect of the most valuable and extensive Sanskrit Literature of India, written as follows :—

Says he, "I have never found one among them (—the Orientalists themselves—), who could deny that a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia."

"I certainly never met with any Orientalists who ventured to maintain that the Arabic and

Sanskrit Poetry could be compared to that of the great European nations."

"I doubt whether the Sanskrit literature be as valuable as that of our Saxon and Norman progenitors." (Macaulay's Minute on Education.)

This certainly sounds strange to us ; nay, it will sound strange to many, not to say to all who are not prejudiced ; especially, as Sanskrit language has been *emphatically pronounced* by Western *Savants*, as will be shown later on, to be (1) "a perfect literary language," (2) "beautifully musical" and "magnificently grand," (3) "of unequalled transparency of structure" (which gives it) "an indisputable right to the first place among the tongues of the Indo-European family," (4) "of wonderfull structure," and "more exquisitely refined than either" (Greek or Latin), and (5) claims a literature that has "an immensity of bulk," which "is absolutely bewildering."

And all this notwithstanding, the aforesaid charge against Sanskrit was eloquently made, even when Lord Macaulay himself was fully aware that, he knew nothing at all either of Sanskrit or Arabic. For, in regard to this, he himself had the goodness to unreservedly admit his total ignorance of these languages, as he confessed that, "I have no knowledge of either

Sanskrit or Arabic. But, I have done what I could do, from a correct estimate of their value."

"I have read translations of the most celebrated Arabic and Sanskrit works. I have conversed both here and at home with men distinguished by their proficiency in the eastern tongues. I am quite ready to take the Oriental learning at the valuation of the Orientalists themselves." (Macaulay's Minute on Education.)

This sort of anti-Indian bias of Lord Macaulay has been too well-known to be disguised or concealed. As such, therefore, Sir Henry Cotton appears to have naturally written thus:—"Even so great a man as Lord Macaulay, with his liberal ideas, was not free from violent anti-native prejudice; and his description of the Bengalee character, which has tended to influence injuriously the attitude of thousands towards the Bengalee race, may be said to undoubtedly reflect the feeling of his contemporaries." (*Vide* New India. p 37. Edition 1904).

One more instance of the deep-rooted prejudice, also of a great philosopher, as it strikes even Western scholars, and naturally grieves them, on account of the great injury that it actually does to the cause of truth. For example, we see Professor Max-Muller writing as follows:—"Dugald Stewart (a Scotch philosopher), rather

than admit a relationship between Hindus and Scots, would rather believe that the whole Sanskrit language and the whole of Sanskrit literature—mind, a literature extending over three thousand years, and larger than the ancient literature of either Greece or Rome,—was a forgery of those wily priests, the Brahmins.” (*Vide* “What can India Teach us ?” p. 28. Edition 1883).

Thus, the Reader will have easily perceived that, bias beyond measure and inveterate prejudice that knew no bounds, were at the root (a) of the aforesaid unjust misrepresentations, (b) of the marshalling of things that betrayed an altogether perverted taste, and (c) of the arraying of views before the public as if they were universally accepted, when as a matter of fact they were not in the least shared by them.

Now, for *requisite comparison*, and for enabling thereby the Reader to *form a correct idea of the intrinsic value of Sanskrit*, I venture to place before him the opinion of some of the most eminent Sanskritists and Orientalists, who have also been known to be not only thoroughly conversant with, but even masters of, many languages of Europe, *past and present*. Says Sir William Jones, in respect of Sanskrit language, as under:—“It (Sanskrit) is of a wonderful structure, more perfect than the Greek, more copious

than the Latin, and more exquisitely refined than either." (*Vide Asiatic Researches*. Vol. I). While, Professor Max-Muller declares it to be "the most wonderful language" (p 15), and adds that. "We find Sanskrit as a perfect literary language." (p. 25). "That the whole of Sanskrit language and the whole of Sanskrit literature—mind, a literature extending over three thousand years and larger than the ancient literature of either Greece or Rome,—(p 28), "is more, I believe, than the whole classical literature of Greece and Italy put together." (p 84). Moreover, he says:—"What then is it that gives to Sanskrit its claim on our attention, and its supreme importance in the eyes of the historian?" "First of all its antiquity,—for we know Sanskrit at an earlier period than the Greek. But, what is far more important than its mere chronological antiquity is (the) antique state of (its) preservation." (pp 22, 23).

"Nor is that all, for even that Proto-Aryan language is clearly the result of a long, long process of thought" (p 25).

"This is what I call history in the true sense of the word, something really worth knowing." (pp 26, 27). (*Vide* "India. What can it Teach us?" Edition 1883.)

Besides, as to the real worth and historical value of the vast Vedic Literature, Max-

Muller states that, "The Veda has a two-fold interest : It belongs to the history of the world and to the history of India. In the history of the world, the Veda fills a gap which no literary work in any other language could fill. It carries us back to times of which we have no records anywhere, and gives us the very words of a generation of men, of whom otherwise we could form but the vaguest estimate by means of conjectures and inferences. As long as man continues to take an interest in the history of his race, and as long as we collect in libraries and museums the relics of former ages, the first place in that long row of books which contains the records of the Aryan branch of mankind, will belong forever to the Rig-veda." (*Vide* Max-Muller's "Ancient History of Sanskrit Literature." p 63. Edition 1859).

And again he says, " Sanskrit Literature, if studied only in the right spirit, is full of human interests, full of lessons which even Greek could never teach us." (India. What can it teach us ? p 5. Edition 1883).

A Pictet observes that Sanskrit is " the most beautiful perhaps of all languages,"—the " language, already perfected to a very high degree"...(*Origins Indo-Europeanes. pp 1-2*).

Other erudite scholars also write as follows in respect of Sanskrit:—Says Professor H H. Wil-

son, "It is impossible to conceive a language so beautifully musical, or so magnificently grand, as that which contains many of the verses of Bhavabhûti and Kâlidâs;" (*The Theatre of the Hindus.* p lxiii. Ed. 1835).

Whitney observes, "Its (Sanskrit's) exceeding age, its remarkable conservation of primitive material and forms, its unequalled transparency of structure, give it an indisputable right to the first place among the tongues of the Indo-European family." (Whitney's *Language and the Study of Language.* p 4. Edition 1867).

And as regards the vast extent of Sanskrit Literature, Max-Müller writes:—"It is difficult to give an idea of the enormous extent and variety of that literature." (What can India teach us ? p 83. Edition 1883).

While, Sir William Jones says, "Wherever we direct our attention to Hindu Literature, the notion of infinity presents itself ; and surely, the longest life would not suffice for a single perusal of works, that rise and swell protuberant like the Himâlayas, above the bulkiest compositions of every land, beyond the confines of India."

In the same way, Sir Monier Williams remarks that, "An adequate idea of the luxu-

riance of Sanskrit Literature can with difficulty be conveyed to Occidental scholars." p. 1.

"In India, Literature, like the whole face of Nature, is on a gigantic scale." p 309.

"There is in fact, an immensity of bulk about this (Sanskrit Poetry), as about every other department of Sanskrit Literature, which to a European mind, accustomed to a more limited horizon, is absolutely bewildering." (*Indian Wisdom*. p 309. Edition 1875).

Evidently, this having been the case, all will certainly admit the conclusion, not to say *the patent fact*, that Sanskrit *ever was, is even now, and will always be, the true source of information, the proper vehicle for knowing us well, nay, for even knowing how we really were in ancient times, to what civilization we had attained, and to what pitch of greatness and granduer we had reached.* But, all this notwithstanding, Lord Macaulay, all at once, and even at one stroke of pen, declared this priceless treasure of Sanskrit Literature almost worthless. He thus waved his magic wand, and by making this our divine language and sacred Literature appear useless, shut, for sometime at any rate, the doors of true information, and *the genuine* sources of knowledge, through which, and through which only, our past achievements in Science and Art, language and literature, religion and philosophy,

Government and territorial conquests, material and moral progress, could definitely be ascertained.

Obviously, therefore, it seems that Lord Macaulay was not aware of the *intrinsic value* and the *real merits* of Sanskrit; nor was he aware of the *voluminous* and yet *invaluable* Sanskrit Literature,—*the richest legacy bequeathed to us by our revered ancestors*,—when he made the afore-said remarks in respect of Sanskrit, perhaps in an unguarded hour (ante pp. 7,8,9).

Probably, it is owing to this sort of bias and ignorance, that some great men of the West, supposed to be the statesmen of the foremost rank, make a statement in respect of our *incapacity for self-government*, which is not only not true, but even betrays great ignorance of history, as it has not in the least been warranted by facts. By making this sort of statement, they appear to have claimed for the nations of the West, a monopoly of the virtues that evidently constitute a capacity for self-government, and shown the incapacity for self-government of the nations of the East. But, the great wonder is, that they do all this on the very face of facts which having been well known to all, are clear enough to make manifest that, *things are by all means not as they would represent them to be*. For, Turkey, which is only at arm's length,

and has been suddenly aroused from her great slumber, has already given Parliament and *the gift of Self-Government to her people*, and has been making an amazingly laudable progress, firmly and quietly, without *a tall talk and without any loud cry*. Persia has been equally engaged in the same arduous task; and China has, for years, been observed, *up and doing*. While Japan, *the most precious and brilliant gem of the Orient of modern times*, has already *proved and shown to the world, her great capacity and fitness for Self-Government*, in such a marvellous way, that she has become the object of *wonder and admiration, of respect and profound awe*, of not only the East but also of the West.

And to come nearer home, even India gives abundant proofs of *her hoary Self-Government and her ancient autonomous Administration, of her Popular Assemblies and her Village Communities*, as will be seen not only from the Vedic evidence, but also from the Ukkal Inscriptions of Southern India, of the early part of the tenth Century, and even from other occidental testimony, of which, however, I shall give the requisite details presently. But, poor Ind, with all her *ancient greatness and grandeur, her solid Government and sound administration, her extensive Tertiary colonies and Mediæval wide Empire*, is now a conquered country; and her

sons are fallen from their very high rank in the scale of nations, which they enjoyed for centuries, many a time, before. Nevertheless, with all the present subjection of Ind, she is yet proud, and justly so, of her existing *Village Communities*, her *Village Institutions*, and her ancient *Popular Assemblies*.

However, it seems, that some Westerners have not yet been aware that of all the nations in the world, the Hindus were *the most* ancient nation that was *self-governed*, although they have now fallen from their high estate. For, formerly they enjoyed fully, and even now enjoy partially, the benefits resulting from their *Village Communities*, as these are, and have always been supposed to be, the *Sheet-Anchor of Indian State craft*, as rightly observed by Sir James Caird.

And here, by the bye, I beg to observe that, *Village Communes* are the best forms of the application of the principles of *Self-Government*, and the very fact of their prevalence and existence in India, though now on a small and limited scale, is, by all means, a sufficient refutation of Mr. Balfour's assertion, at any rate so far as India is concerned, that "No Oriental nation had ever shown a trace of capacity for Self-Government." I, therefore, make no apology to state the views here, of Colonel Sleeman, as

he had wide acquaintance with, and much knowledge of, India. Says he, 'No one knew India who did not know the Indians in their Village Communities. When in Indian history we hear so much of kings and emperors, of Râjas and Mahâ Râjas, we are apt to think of India as an Eastern monarchy ruled by a Central power and without any trace of that *Self-Government* which forms the pride of England ; but those who have studied the political life of India will tell you quite the opposite.'

Besides, it clearly appears from the records of the Gupta-Empire,¹ that there were *then* petty *Republican Governments* in Punjab, Eastern Rajputana, and Mâlva, constituted by united clans or tribes, as we shall show later on.

And going so far back as the Buddhist period B. C. 600, we find *aristocratic Republics* probably in full swing, inasmuch as, the records reveal the survival of *Republican Governments*, side by side with monarchies, "*with either complete or modified independence.*" (*Vide Rhys Davids' Buddhist India, p 2, Ed. 1903.*)

But, above all, even in the pre-historic Vedic times, the Indo-Aryans had all the crude beginnings and the growth of free Political In-

1. From A. D. 320 to A. D. 606. *Vide* Vincent Smith's *Early History of India*. Edition 1908. p 271.

stitutions like Europe, which, therefore, we shall, with details, show and prove, in the following Chapters.

If, however, the Reader thinks that I have exaggerated facts, I only venture to quote here an extract from an *English Daily—The Times of India*, as that will probably satisfy him. Says the Daily, "The existence of the (village) community has been traced to the earliest times of which history speaks, and even beyond these, when history is lost in the twilight of fable, it can be easily seen in the mist." (*The Times of India*, dated 18th June 1891).

It would, moreover, not be out of place to adduce additional foreign proof, of the existence of *Representative Institutions* in India, even in ancient times, and of the vast stores of knowledge and interest contained in her. I shall, therefore, quote Sir Henry Maine, from his "*Village Communities*," Edition 1890, in view of corroborating the fact. For, says he, "this remarkable (Indian) society, pregnant with interest at every point, and for the moment easily open to our observation, is undoubtedly passing away," (p. 24). And later on he says, "I must honestly admit that much which had a grandeur of its own is being replaced by a great deal which is poor and ignoble," (p. 26); adding further that, "It would be absurd to deny that

the disintegration of Eastern usage and thought is attributable to British dominion," (pp 26, 27). "The East is certainly full of fragments of ancient society. Of these, the most instructive, because the most open to sustained observation, are to be found in India," (p. 13).

Here, therefore, it would be interesting to see where, and how far, India has been found capable of giving, in this wise, lessons to the world. We, accordingly, find Sir Henry Maine writing thus, in brief:—"Let me at this point attempt to indicate to you the sort of instruction which India may be expected to yield to the student of historical jurisprudence." (p 15).

"Passing from wild tribes to the more advanced assemblages of men to be found in India, it may be stated without any hesitation that the rest of the Indian evidence, whence-so-ever collected, gives colour to the theory of the origin of a great part of law in the Patriarchal Family." (p 17).

"But, the Patriarchal Family, when occupied with those agricultural pursuits which are the exclusive employment of many millions of men in India, is generally found as the unit of a larger natural group, the Village Community. The Village Community is, in India itself, the

source of a land-law, which, in bulk at all events, may be not unfairly compared with the real property-law of England." (p 18).

"The whole of the codified law of the country—that is, the law contained in the Code of Manu, and the treatises of the various schools of commentators who have written on that Code and greatly extended it—is theoretically connected together by certain definite ideas of a sacerdotal nature." "But on comparing the written and the unwritten law, it appears clearly that the sacerdotal notions which permeate the first have invaded it from without, and are of Brahminical origin." (p. 20).

Besides, Sir Henry Maine emphatically declares that, "It (India) is the great repository of verifiable phenomena of ancient usage and ancient juridical thought" (p 22), that, "the Indian Village Community is a living, and not a dead, institution" (p 12), that "the real India contains one priestly caste,.....—the highest of all.....some princely houses, and a certain number of tribes, village communities, and guilds, which still in our day advance a claim,.....to belong to the second or third of the castes, recognised by the Brahmanical writers. But, otherwise, caste is merely a name for trade or occupation, and the sole tangible effect of the Brahmanical theory is that it creates a religious

sanction for what is really a primitive and natural distribution of classes. The true view of India is that, as a whole, it is divided into a vast number of independent, self-acting, organised social groups—trading, manufacturing, cultivating.” “The smaller organic groups of Indian society are very differently situated. They are constantly dwelling on traditions of a certain sort, they are so constituted that one man’s interests and impressions correct those of another, and some of them have in their council of Elders a permanent machinery for declaring traditional usage, and solving doubtful points,” (pp 57, 58. Village Communities. Ed.1890).

For further corroboration, I give next an extract from Mr. Anstey’s speech in the Meeting of the East Indian Association in London. Says Mr. Anstey :—“We are apt to forget in this country (England), when we talk of preparing people in the East by education and all that sort of thing, for Municipal Government and Parliamentary Government, that the East is the parent of Municipalities. Local Self-Government in the widest acceptation of the term, is as old as the East itself. No matter what may be the religion of the people who inhabit what we call the East, there is not a portion of the Country from West to East, from North to South, which is not swarming with Municipalities ; and not

only so, but like to our Municipalities of old, they are all bound together as in a species of net-work, so that you have ready made to your hand, the frame of a great system of representation."

So far then, as regards *the organising and self-governing powers of Ind,* and that too, *in very ancient times.* Let us, therefore, see, even with the aid of light thrown on the subject by European writers and English authors, what legacy our *hoary* Indo-Aryan Ancestors have bequeathed to us—*their descendants*,—who have been supposed by many a Westerner to be no better than negroes and savages, because of our swarthy colour.

Says Max-Müller as follows :—"What have we inherited from the dark dwellers on the Indus and the Ganges ?.....Their historical records extend in some respects so far beyond all other records, and have been preserved to us in such perfect and such legible documents, that we can learn from them lessons which we can learn nowhere else, and supply missing links (which we can well afford to miss), the link between Ape and Man." (India. What Can it teach us ? p 21, Edition 1883).

While Professor Seeley declares that, "Perhaps, no race has shown a greater aptitude for

civilization. Its customs grew into laws, and were consolidated in codes. It imagined the division of labour. It created poetry and philosophy and the beginnings of science"....."So far then, it resembled those gifted races which created our own civilization," (p 241).

"We (British people) are not cleverer than the Hindu ; our minds are not richer or larger than his. We cannot astonish him, as we astonish the barbarian, by putting before him ideas that he never dreamed of. He can match from his poetry our sublimest thoughts ; even our science perhaps has few conceptions that are altogether novel to him, (p 244). *Vide* "The Expansion of England." By Professor J. R. Seeley, M. A. Edition 1890.

But, more than this, Dr. Sir W. W. Hunter writes that, "The Brahmans, therefore, were a body of men, who in an early stage of this world's history, bound themselves by a rule of life, the essential precepts of which were self-culture and self-restraint. The Brahmans of the present day are the result of nearly 3,000 years of hereditary education and self-restraint, and they have evolved a type of mankind quite distinct from the surrounding population. Even the passing traveller in India marks them out. The Brâhman stands apart from both, (*i. e.* the Rajput or the Aryan warrior class and the Non-

Aryans)—the man of self-centred refinement. He is an example of a class, becoming the ruling power in a country, not by force of arms, but by the vigour of hereditary culture and temperance."

"The paramount position which the Brahmans won, resulted in no small measure, from the benefits which they bestowed." (*Vide* "Indian Empire," pp. 96, 97, Second Edition).

And Sir Henry Maine likewise maintains that, "India has given to the world Comparative Philology and Comparative Mythology"..... "India not only contains (or to speak more accurately, did contain) an Aryan language older than any other descendant of the common mother-tongue,.....but it includes a whole world of Aryan Institutions, Aryan customs, Aryan laws, Aryan ideas, Aryan beliefs, in a far earlier stage of growth and development than any which survive beyond its borders. There are undoubtedly in it the materials for a new science, possibly including many branches." (*Vide* Sir Henry Sumner Maine's "Village Communities." Edition 1890, pp 210, 211).

Thus, the fact remains that West is the *disciple* of the East, not only in matters of *Self-Government*, but also in other Sciences and Arts, learning and wisdom ; and there is no

gainsaying it. For, we all know that, it is the East that brightens the West. It is, in fact, the East that fertilises the West. Nay, *it is only the East that has given life to the West*. And it is *East alone*, that has been supposed, *from the dawn of history*, and even from pre-historic times, *to be the chief civilising agency*, that has spread the seeds of Civilisation in the West and all the world over.

Evidently, the fact is as clear as the broad day light, and no proof is wanted to establish its truth. But, if any were needed, I would produce the evidence of a great scholar, distinguished alike for his vast erudition as for his breadth of views. Max-Müller, for that is the name of the learned writer, says thus in perspicuous and forcible language :—

“We all come from the East—all that we value most has come to us from the East, and in going to the East, not only those who have received a special Oriental training, but every body who has enjoyed the advantages of a liberal, that is, of a truly historical education, ought to feel that he is going to his ‘old home’, full of memories, if only he can read them.” (*What can India Teach us ?* pp. 31, 32, Edition 1883.)

And it is no exaggeration to say, that it is *Ind and the Eastern Countries* that are the

Fountain Source of life of the West and of all the world, the Nurse of Sciences, the Mother of delightful Arts, and the *Scene* of glorious actions. If, however, the Reader thinks that I embellish and season the facts to render them palatable, or that I colour them to heighten their beauty, let me read to him and quote what Sir William Jones, the great Orientalist, has said in respect thereof, about! over a quarter and a century ago, on his *Voyage to India*.

“When I was at sea last August (that is in August 1783), on my voyage to this country (India) I had long and ardently desired to visit, I found one evening, on inspecting the observations of the day, that *India* lay before us, *Persia* on our left, whilst a breeze from *Arabia* blew nearly on our stern. A situation so pleasing in itself, and to me so new, could not fail to awaken a train of reflections in a mind, which had only been accustomed to contemplate with delight the eventful histories and agreeable fictions of the Eastern world. It gave me inexpressible pleasure to find myself in the midst of so noble an amphitheatre, almost encircled by the vast regions of Asia, which has ever been esteemed the nurse of sciences, the inventress of delightful and useful arts, the scene of glorious actions, fertile in the productions of human genius, and infinitely diversified in the forms of

religion and government, in the laws, manners, customs, and languages, as well as in the features and complexions of men. I could not help remarking how important and extensive a field was yet unexplored, and how many solid advantages unimproved.'

Moreover, the observations of M. Louis Jaccoliot, the author of "*La Bible Dans L' Inde*," and also those of the translator of the work, seem to be very pertinent indeed, as regards *the attitude* of the West, or say of Europe, in respect of India and the East generally. As such, therefore, I cannot resist the temptation to quote from both the writers, in view of elucidating the facts. For, says M. Louis Jaccoliot that, "the European when he first sets foot upon the soil of India, proud of the history and civilization of his father-land, and crammed with extravagant prejudices, comes fully persuaded that he brings with him a morality the most lofty, a philosophy the most rational, and a religion the most pure ; and then witnessing the impotent toils of Christian missionaries, who with difficulty assemble their few Paria proselytes, murmurs his scorn of semi-brutified fanaticism....." (p 15).

"Very few travellers have sought to understand India, very few have submitted to the labour necessary to a knowledge of her past splendours ; looking only at the surface, they

have even denied them,.....with an unreasoning confidence of criticism that made them the easy victims of ignorance," (p 15).

"And yet, what hidden wealth to be unveiled. What treasures of literature, of history, of morale and philosophy to be made known to the world." (p 16).

"To fathom ancient India, all knowledge acquired in Europe avails nought; the study must re-commence as the child learns to read, and the harvest is too distant for lukewarm energies," (p 17. *La Bible Dans L' Inde*. Edition 1870).

In the same way, the adept translator of *La Bible Dans L' Inde* (—known as the Bible in India, or "Hindu Origin of Hebrew and Christian Revelation"—), who signs as G. R., clearly writes thus :—"And the most piously disingenuous intelligence can scarce fail to see how unfavourably the grovelling selfishness of our Western copy, contrasts with the more truly divine spirit of the Eastern Original. (*Vide* "La Bible Dans L' Inde". Translator's Preface, p. X, Edition 1870).

However, more than this, and last but not least, I venture to quote Gibbon, the celebrated historian, as he, in his master-piece—"The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,"—presents

both the continents—Europe and Asia—in their true colours, during ancient times and the hoary days of the past, showing the Orient to be *the seat of Arts*, and the Occident—*the retreat of savages*. For, says he, “In the more early age of the world, whilst the forest that covered Europe afforded a retreat to a few wandering savages, the inhabitants of Asia were already collected into populous cities, and reduced under extensive empires, the seat of the arts, of luxury, and of despotism¹.” (*Vide* “Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.” Vol. I, p 156. Chandos Classics, Edition 1893).

1 (a) It is certainly very amusing to observe that, while Englishmen, as also erudite Occidental statesmen, scholars, and renowned authors grieve to see, and therefore cannot tolerate, *despotism* practised by Orientals in the Orient, they (the Occidentals) seem to tolerate it with complacency, when practised by themselves and by their own Government in India. Nay, they appear even to recommend and allow it with semblance of reason, and show of justice. For, we find Lord Macaulay pleading and writing as follows:—“We know that India cannot have a free Government. But, she may have the next best thing—a firm and impartial despotism.” (*Vide* “The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay by his nephew—the Right Honourable Sir George Otto Trevelyan, Bart. M. P. Popular Edition. 1893. p 287).

(b) Moreover, Sir Henry Sumner Maine also refers to “the spectacle of that most extraordinary experiment, the British Government of India, the virtually despotic government of a dependency by a free people.” (*Vide*. His work “The Village Communities in the East and West.” Edition 1890. p 233).

Asia or the Orient, therefore, very well knew, and even now knows, valour and conquest, *Government and the art of Self-Government*, as she subjugated extensive continents and maintained vast empires.

Having had, therefore, due regard to all these facts, Sir Monier Williams seems to have admitted and written thus:—"It will not, of course, be supposed that in our Eastern Empire, we have to deal with ordinary races of men. We are not there brought in contact with savage tribes who melt away before the superior force and intelligence of Europeans. Rather are we placed in the midst of great and ancient peoples, who, some of them tracing back their origin to the same stock as ourselves, attained a high degree of civilization, when our forefathers were barbarians,¹ and had a polished language, a cultivated literature, and abstruse systems of philosophy, centuries before English existed even in name." (*Vide Indian Wisdom. Introduction. p. XVI, Edition 1875*).

1 Dr. William Francis Collier, L. L. D., describes the Ancient Britons as under:—"The natives of the interior sowed no corn, but lived (55 B. C.) on milk and flesh. Those far north were often obliged to feed on the roots and leaves which grew wild in the woods. They clad themselves in skins, leaving their limbs bare; and on these they stained blue patterns with the juice of a plant called *Woad*..... "They.....taught the worship of one God; but the serpent, the sun and moon, and the oak shared their veneration; and their altars were stained with the blood of men and women, whom, as Cæsar tells, they burned in large numbers, inclosed in immense cages of wicker-work." (*Vide Collier's History of the British Empire. Edition 1882. pp 10,11*).

This being the case, the tendency of some Westerners to pervert facts, and to monopolise to themselves everything that is good or worthy of praise, nay to despise, simply on account of bias, the wisdom of the East, has justly provoked the wrath of historians like Gibbon and Ockley, who have, consequently, in no small measure, criticised the ever biased and one-sided views of prejudiced writers, and taken them to task for their conduct, their contempt for all that is Asiatic, and their want of knowledge in respect of things Oriental. For, says Gibbon as under, with reference to Eusebius, as the latter openly advocated suppression of facts which were not favourable to the cause that he had espoused:—

“The gravest of the ecclesiastical historians, Eusebius himself, indirectly confesses, that he has related whatever might redound to the glory, and that he has suppressed all that could tend to the disgrace, of the (Christian) religion. Such an acknowledgement will naturally excite a suspicion that a writer, who has so openly violated one of the fundamental laws of history, has not paid a very strict regard to the observance of the other ; and the suspicion will derive additional credit from the character of Eusebius, which was less tinctured with credulity, and more practised in the art of Courts, than that of almost any of his contemporaries.” (*Vide De-*

cline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Vol. I, p. 429. Chandos Classics, Edition 1893).

Ockley, however, appears to be more serious, and even plainer still ; and I cannot resist the temptation to quote him *in extenso*, as his remarks are very pertinent, and seem in every way to be obviously relevant, not to say *aptly applicable* to the present discussion. For, he observes, "If Providence hath removed us to a greater distance from the influence of those genial rays which ripen the wits of the Eastern nations, it hath made us abundant amends by indulging us in this conceit, that we are wiser than all the rest of the world besides."

"There are some sorts of pleasing madness of which it would be cruelty to cure a man. By bringing him to his senses, you make him miserable."

"You will ask me, perhaps, what is the meaning of all this ? Why, in good truth, the meaning of it is, a just indignation against the impertinence of those who imagine that they know everything, when in reality they know nothing."

"And to be more particular, the folly of the Westerns in despising the wisdom of the Eastern nations, and looking upon them as brutes and barbarians, whilst we arrogate to ourselves every-

thing that is wise and polite. And, if we chance to light upon a just thought, we applaud ourselves upon the discovery, though it was better understood three thousand years ago"!

"This happens to us through want of good reading, and a true way of thinking. For, the case is this, that little smattering of knowledge what we have is entirely derived from the East. They first communicated it to the Greeks (a vain, conceited people, who never penetrated the depths of Oriental wisdom); from whom the Romans had theirs. And, after barbarity had spread itself over the Western world, the Arabians, by their conquests restored it again in Europe. And it is the wildest conceipt that can be imagined, for us to suppose that we have greater geniuses, or greater application than is to be found in those countries." (Ockley's History of the Saracens, p 337. Sixth Edition 1857).

Europe, therefore, having been fed chiefly and perhaps exclusively, as observed by Professor Max-Müller (*infra* p. 35), on the thoughts of Greece, Rome, and Palestine, it had naturally a very limited horizon of vision. As a consequence, it could only see *thus far, and no further*; that is, it could not see *beyond the Occident*. And the fact has been admitted even by Professor Max-Müller and Sir Monier Williams, who have thought India to be the Land of Wis-

dom and the Land of immense Literature. For, the former says that, "There is hardly any department of learning which has not received new light and new life from the ancient literature of India" (p 141). * * * "We, here in Europe, * * * have been nurtured almost exclusively on the thoughts of Greeks and Romans, and of one Semitic race, the Jewish" p 6. (What can India Teach us ? pp 141, 6, Edition 1883). While Sir Monier Williams thinks the immensity of Indian Literature to be "bewildering," and the "European mind—accustomed to a more limited horizon".....(Indian Wisdom, p 309, Edition 1875).

The hackneyed monopoly, therefore, of some Westerners, of every thing that is worthy of praise, and their boast of Wisdom, seem to be preposterous, not to say a grievous show, and altogether out of place. In the circumstances, we have been led to suppose that the usual dictum, that *Self-Government* was never known in the East, is manifestly neither based upon facts, nor upon historical evidence. And the *Self-satisfying* assumption, that absolute despotism is the only proper Government for Orientals, appears not only gratuitous, but seems, moreover, to have been altogether upset by stern facts, which we shall endeavour to prove in the sequel, although there would still be many, who, in blind defiance of

incontrovertible testimony, would ever continue to say otherwise, and call the East and the Hindus *barbarous*, at least *for self-satisfaction*, if for nothing else ; notwithstanding the fact, that the Hindus have been a nation, *far advanced in civilization*, and are certainly *not savages*, as the majority of Westerners always suppose, or make others think, and would have us believe. (*Vide Supra pp 17,18,19,22,23,24,25,34*).

To silence, therefore, such persons, and set at rest their vapourings, I would, before proceeding to the next chapter, produce here independent evidence, from the pen of Count Bjornstjerna and Monsieur Delbos, in respect of the most ancient and indigenous civilization of Ind—(Bhârata-Varsha), and the deep debt which the world beside owes to Âryâvarta. For, says Bjornstjerna, “It is there (in Âryâvarta) that we must seek not only for the Cradle of the Brâhman Religion, but for the Cradle of the high civilization of the Hindus, which gradually extended itself in the West to Ethiopia, to Egypt, to Phœnicia ; in the East to Siam, to China and to Japan, and to Sumatra ; in the North to Persia, to Chaldea, and to Colchis ; whence it came to Greece, to Rome, and at length to the remote abode of the Hyperboreans.” (*Theogony of the Hindus, p 168*).

Now, another *Savant*, Monsieur Delbos emphatically declares that, "The influence of that civilization, worked out thousands of years ago in India, is round and about us, every day of our lives. It pervades every corner of the civilized world¹. Go to America, and you find there as in Europe, the influence of that civilization, which came originally from the banks of the Ganges."

But, apart from *this great influence of civilization, which was, and is even now perceptible all the world over,*¹ *ancient Ind knew also how to govern her own People, and, as such, was fully adept in the Science and Art of Self-Government, as she had her own Statesmen and her Political Institutions, of which the evidence is found in the oldest document in the world—the Rig-Veda—as also in other Vedic works, nay, even in the Mediæval Period, and the present times, the details whereof will be placed before the Reader in the following Chapters. However, before I do this, in view of corroborating my statement from an Occidental point of view, I venture to give here an extract from Sir Henry Cotton's work—"New India," where he says, in respect of the administrative capacity and governing powers of our indigenous Rulers, as*

1 *Vide* Chapter XIV of my Work entitled "The Aryāvartīc Home and its Arctic Colonies."

follows :—"Some of these (Indian) States—such as Mysore, Travancore, and Baroda—have shown that, in the hands of their enlightened Chiefs, models of administration may be looked for, under indigenous rule. The names of Sir Dinkar Rao, Sir Mâdhava Rao, and Sir Salar Jang—not to mention other ministers of equal ability, although perhaps of less fame—are sufficient evidence of the aptitude and skill with which the affairs of large and important independent territories have been administered." (*Vide* "New India" p. 194, Edition 1904).

However, notwithstanding all the aforesaid evidence, notwithstanding the richest legacy of *mythology, of philology, of religion, of philosophy, of laws, in fact of all literary wealth* bequeathed to us by our hoary Vedic Ancestors, notwithstanding our *past Representative Institutions and Constitutional Government*, howsoever on a small scale (*vide* Chapters III, IV, and V below), notwithstanding our past heroic grandeur and marvellous literary achievements that *astonish the world even now*, and notwithstanding the patent fact that ancient Ind has been supposed, and rightly too, to be the repertory of all knowledge (*vide supra pp 13,14,20,22,23,25,27,33,35*), she was often deemed, and has been even presently considered by some Westerners, prejudiced on account of ignorance, to be a den of savages, the habitat of negroes

akin only to beasts, and of rank out-siders. (*Vide* above *pp* 2,3,4,5 33; and below *pp* 39,40.)

Nay, the usual epithet of the Indians, as Max-Müller would put it, is "the so called Niggers of India." (*Vide* India. What can it teach us? *p.* 28, Edition 1883). While, Sir Henry Cotton has had unreservedly to admit as follows:—....."We find in private life an almost universal use of irritating expressions in regard to natives, which are not the less offensive, when they proceed from persons who hold a responsible position, and have in other respects the outward seeming of English gentlemen. Among women, who are more rapidly demoralised than men, the abuse of "those horrid natives" is almost universal. Among men, how often do we hear the term "nigger" applied, without any indication of anger or intentional contempt, but as though it were the proper designation of the people of the country!" (*New India*, *p.* 47. Edition 1904).

Max-Müller, therefore, seems naturally to have keenly felt for all these epithets, and as such, sincerely given vent to his expression:—"Certainly, I can imagine nothing more mischievous, more dangerous, more fatal to the permanence of English rule in India, than for the young Civil Servants to go to that country, with the idea that it is a sink of moral depra-

vity, an ant's nest of lies..." (India. What can it teach us ? p. 75, Edition 1883).

We are, therefore, grieved the more, to see this spectacle of ignorance, when as a matter of fact, we can trace back the best that we possess, as Max-Müller tersely puts it, "not merely to a Norman Count, or a Scandinavian Viking, or a Saxon Earl, but to far older ancestors and benefactors, who thousands of years ago were toiling for us in the sweat of their face, and without whom we should never be what we are,—the ancestors of the whole Aryan race, the first framers of our words, the first poets of our thoughts, the first givers of our laws, the first prophets of our gods, and of Him who is God above all gods," "nay, the true representatives of India from age to age." (*Vide* Max-Müller's "India. What can it teach us ?" Edition 1883, pp. 117, 84).

How deep then must be the ignorance of the West as regards the East, and especially Ind ? How lamentably great the want of knowledge, in respect of Ind ! How false the prejudice caused by this ignorance !! How *groundless* and yet *inveterate the bias* consequent upon ignorance, that has, beyond any the least doubt, *caused incalculable mischief to the true cause of Ind !!!*

Naturally, therefore, this sort of ignorance seems to have been resented and viewed with disfavour, in some quarters, even in the West. And there is very good reason for the resentment shown in respect of the matter. Especially, because, the resources of the West and particularly of England, for spreading knowledge of, and dispelling ignorance about India, are, by all means, great, not to say even unlimited. In the circumstances, Sir Henry Maine deemed it proper to observe that, "Ignorance of India is more discreditable to Englishmen than ignorance of Roman law, and it is at the same time more unintelligible in them. It is more discreditable, because, it requires no very intimate acquaintance with contemporary foreign opinion"....."The ignorance is, moreover unintelligible, because knowledge on the subject is extremely plentiful and extremely accessible, since English society is full of men who have made it the study of a life pursued with an ardour of public spirit which would be exceptional even in the field of British domestic politics." (*Vide* Maine's "Village Communities in the East and West." Edition 1890, pp. 22, 23).

Yet, how strong and deep the bias in favour of everything European and especially Greek,—a bias that knows no bounds, and is doubtless beyond all due and reasonable limits. For, we

find even Sir Henry Maine stating as under :—
 “To one small people, covering in its original seat no more than a hands-breadth of territory, it was given to create the principle of Progress, of movement onwards and not backwards or downwards, of destruction tending to construction. That people was the Greek. Except the blind forces of Nature, nothing moves in this world which is not Greek in its origin.” (*Vide* Maine’s *Village Communities*, p. 238. Edition 1890). And here, I would request the Reader to compare this with what has been said on pages 25,33 @ 36,40, even by Maine himself and others.

Again, let us once more see, how this European bias has seriously prejudiced even the right cause of Ind, and affected it to her great injury. (*Vide* *Supra* pp. 7,9,10, *infra* pp 42,43). Nay, we find even Mill—the historian—so far prejudiced as to despise also India’s genuine Arts and Sciences, her industry and wonderful skill, her learning and ancient civilization. Naturally, therefore, Professor Wilson, in his notes to Mill’s *History of British India*, which are meant to serve as an antidote against its poison, appears to have rightly criticised him, taken him to task for his unfair attitude, and made remarks as follows:—
 “This laborious description of the architecture of the Hindus affords some curious specimens of the inveteracy of the author’s prejudices. In his

zeal to undervalue the cavern-temples of the Hindus, he even insinuates that they are not artificial. 'It is difficult to say, how much of the wonderful, in these excavations, may be the work of Nature.' He seemed inclined, with Bryant, to think that it was not impossible that the pyramids had dropped from the clouds, or sprung out of the soil."

Prejudiced portion of Europe, therefore, resting on the most flimsy induction, sometimes draws conclusions, which appear to be extremely absurd on the very face of them. This, probably, is the result of the European mind having been, as remarked by Sir Monier Williams, "accustomed to a more limited horizon." (*Vide* Indian Wisdom, p. 309, Edition 1875. *Supra* p 34).

CHAPTER II.

THE VEDIC PERIOD.

Its Political Institutions of Vital Importance,

AND

Their Marvellous Powers of Organization.

The Vedic Period was certainly *the Dawn of civilization, the Harbinger of refulgent light that had shed immense lustre on the Land of the Seven Rivers, and was the fore-runner of the robust spirit of our Ancestors of the Land.* This, therefore, was well *developed* during the Period, and had even shown signs of *Self-dependence and Self-control.* Nay, it had *budded and blossomed full,* and filled the face of Âryâvarta with *the fruits of the most momentous Political Institutions of the Country, viz. the Sabhâ (सभा) and the Samiti (समिति), that is, the Popular Assembly and the Village Commune or Council.* These, accordingly, as will be seen later on, were in existence here, even *before Greece and Rome were born, or ere yet the Pyramids had looked down upon the Valley of the Nile.*

Now, the atmosphere of the Vedic Period was singularly free, nay enlivening, and even invigorating. It, therefore, *naturally engendered free thought, created a robust spirit, developed unfettered action, and in turn produced that*

unbounded love of liberty, which yet had extreme *grace* in it. Naturally, therefore, the spirit of *Self-dependence* reigned supreme, and the feeling of *Self-control was rampant*, throughout the length and breadth of the Land.

But, with all this, there was the *unique love of law and order*, which, in the very nature of things, graced every action of our noble ancestors, and commanded respect from every quarter. For, the extreme *love of liberty* was deeply imbued with *very high ideals* and *lofty sentiments*; nay, the spirit of *self-dependence* was in no way misguided by false conceptions; and the true affection for our *Mother Country* was *saturated with, and founded upon*, considerations of great strength of character, and upon unquestionably the highest standard of perfection, that our Vedic Ancestors had placed before themselves. Evidently, all this pre-eminently served to stand as *the key-stone* of our great Vedic Empire,¹ and our subsequent *Sovereign-Power* in the Continent of India and her widely scattered Colonies, as I shall presently endeavour to prove, by every available testimony, that I can lay my hands upon, while scrutinizing *the invaluable Vedic Literature* and other *authentic sources* of information. Our Vedic *Popular Assembly* (सभा) and

1. As to the vast extent of our Vedic and *post-Vedic Colonial Empire*, vide my work—"The Aryāvartīc Home and Its Arctic Colonies," Chapter XIV.

the *Village-Commune* (समिति), seem to have had their origin in the *Primitive Patriarchal rule*, which had, in the early ages of the hoary Rig-Vedic past, exercised unbounded influence upon, and moulded the form and character of, *our most ancient Vedic Government*. For instance, Agni, who was the पुरोहित, ऋत्विज, and होता, that is, the *chosen Priest, the minister* that sacrificed at the proper seasons, and the *herald* that called the Gods to enjoy the offerings (Rig-Veda I. 1.1), represented the *first* and the great Angiras Rishi—one of the *semi-divine patriarchs of yore* (त्वमग्ने प्रथमो अंगिरा ऋषिः R. V. I. 31. 1). Nay, Agni was even declared the *first king of men* (नहुषस्य विष्पतिं...R. V. I. 31.11), and was not only called as “*our father*” (पितासि-नस्त्वं), but was also designated as the *patron* (त्वमग्ने प्रमतिः), the *nourisher*, and the *spring of life* (वयस्कृत्); and we his brethren (जामयो वयम्...R. V. I. 31. 10).

In time, these *primitive patriarchs* had formed themselves into a number of groups, and were the *recognised heads* of different families, who were under the guidance and rule of the patriarchs. Naturally, therefore, these were considered to be the *spokesmen* in all important discussions, whether, *religious, social, communal, national, or political*. The discussions, however, were, primarily, of a *sacrificial character*, and were, in the very nature of things, conduc-

ted in the Sacrificial-Hall, by the persons assembled. The responsible persons present formed themselves into a *Sacrificial Assembly*, which was called, or was known as विदथ¹; where, though prominence was usually given to religious and sacrificial topics by *universal consent*, still, these were, according to necessity, followed or replaced by other subjects. But, *discussions having local or communal concern, and general or national interest, were also gradually introduced*. The spokesmen of the *local or communal* matters were the *Elders*, or men of experience of the village, and these represented the *Village-Commune* or Council. This was known as समिति.² While discussions which had *general or national interest*, or which concerned the welfare of the Country at large, were reserved for consideration of the *Representatives* chosen from amongst the Elders of the *Village Commune* or Council. The meeting of these *Representatives* was said to be the *Popular Assembly* or सभा³, of which we shall give the requisite detail in the sequel, along with that of समिति.

Thus, it will be perceived that even during the Vedic period, there were three *Public Bodies*

1. *Vide* Rig-Veda, I, 153, 2 (विदथेयु); I. 153. 3; I. 162, 1 (विदथे); &c. &c.

2. *Vide* infra p. 50; as also Atharva Veda, VII. 12. 1, where सभा and समिति have been declared to be Prajā-pati's daughters. (प्रजापतेर्दुहितरौ। See Chapter III below).

or *Assemblies* (त्रीणि.....सदांसि । R. V. III. 38. 6), apparently of a *representative character*. Of these, one was (1) Sacrificial and Religious (विद्य), the other was (2) Rural and Social (समिति), while the (3) third was Political, Popular, and General (सभा) ; of which, however, more particulars would be stated, by and by.

The fact that these Bodies were of a *Representative character* has been admitted even by Western scholars, writers, and administrators. For, says Maine that, " One singular proof of this variety of interests, and at the same time of the essentially representative character of the Village Council is constantly furnished."....as " there is great pressure from all sections of the community to be represented in it." (*Vide* Maine's Village Communities. pp. 123,124. Edition 1890).

The several families that inhabited each village followed various professions in life, and were engaged in different intellectual pursuits, as appears doubtless from the testimony of the Rig-veda (IX. 112. 1, 2, 3, 4). The heads of these families were the *Village Elders*, and these formed the *Village Communes* for the good of the village, which, in time, supplied, by co-operation and mutual help, their own wants, even in the hoary Rig-Vedic period, and created not only a *lively competition*, as far as it lay in their power, but also the ever desired *self-reliance*, and the spirit

of *self-dependence*. When, therefore, they became habituated to this, they gradually understood their own responsibilities, and, slowly but steadily, managed their own affairs, especially as they considered themselves to be but small *republics* and miniature states.

Evidently, the ultimate object of these *Republican Institutions* was the good of all ; and, therefore the *Village communes or Communities*, as also the *Popular Assembly* endeavoured, in every possible way, to establish law and order, rightly considering that this was the essential, nay, the one and the only thing, that was likely to bring about the highest blessings of peace. In this way, *law and order prevailed*, and *profound peace reigned supreme*, throughout the length and breadth of Âryâvarta—the land of the Seven Rivers—, during the great Vedic Period, as the innumerable works on Literature, Religion, Philosophy, Science, and Arts, would amply testify. Obviously, the battles and contests with the Asuras or the Ahur Mazda comrades, had not come in their way, as they were fought *beyond the confines* of Âryâvarta. Thus, peace having been secured, the *Village Communes* and *Popular Assemblies* found sufficient time to devote to the comforts of the people, to their much needed conveniences, and to the redress of their grievances. And to make assurance doubly sure, the first

step that the people took in this direction, was to consult the *Village Elders*, whose opinion owing to their position, large experience, and mature judgment, was by all means entitled to weight. This practice, moreover, had taught them the secret of the success consequent upon the advice given by the Elders. They, therefore, had gradually turned their attention to the value and esteem that should be attached to the opinion of the heads of the *Communes*, that is, the *Samitis* (समिति) or the *Village Communities*, whose *Representatives* they really were. Thus, by and by, the opinion of these *Village Councils* or *Communes*, and of *Popular Assemblies* gained ground, and *Public Opinion*, slowly but steadily, asserted itself, as a matter of course. In as much as, it was rightly thought to be of great moment and of vital importance, in the execution of public duties, and the management of affairs concerning the general weal of the country at large.

Thus, *public opinion* having become an *important factor*, not to say an *indispensable necessity*, the *Sabha*¹ (सभा)¹ or the *Popular Assembly*¹ of the *Representatives of the Village Communes*, and the *Samiti*² (समिति)² or the *Village Commune*² which was the *Council of the repre-*

1 A *Sabhā* is an Assembly which should ever consist of *Elders or men of great experience and knowledge*. In this wise, therefore, the *Hitopadesha* says thus:—न सा सभा यत्र न संति ब्रह्माः । Again, the great Exegetist-Sāyana—also defines *Sabhā* as “the Assembly of the wise”: (सभा विदुषां समाजः ।) अ० वे० भाष्यम् । ७. १२. १.

2 *Samiti* (समिति), moreover, has been defined by Sāyana as “the *Commune of Villagers* or of *Village Elders*: (समितिः संयामीजनसभा). Vide ante p. 47, where we had promised to give the requisite details of the aforesaid *Representative Institutions*, viz. the *सभा* or the *Popular Assembly*, and the *समिति* or the *Village Commune*.

representatives of each *Village*, appear to have been formed, and *the desired object* secured thereby. In these, therefore, matters of general and local interest were discussed, and unanimous opinion of the Public was invited, as the same was always valued and even eagerly sought, with that earnest attention which the welfare of the nation demanded. By and by, the *Popular Assembly*, which contained *Representatives* of the *Village Communes*, grew very powerful, and having been inclined to have a king as their head as also of the nation they thought of nominating one of *their own choice, with the common consent of the people* (विशस्त्वा सर्वा वाञ्छन्तु। Rig-Veda, X, 173. 1). And herein, I may venture to state, lay *the germ of an elected king and the Brâhmanic Constitutional Monarchy*; since, the king was never allowed to rule arbitrarily, but had *always to yield to Public Opinion or the will of the People*, and was *ever guided by the Representatives of the Nation*, whose wiser Counsels generally prevailed.

The Reader will, at this stage, probably think, that all the aforesaid particulars stated in respect of *the spirit of self-dependence and love of liberty, the Village Councils and Popular Assemblies, Public Opinion and the Elected King*, during the hoary Vedic times, belong more to the domain of *fiction and fable*, and that they have, as such, no historical foundation.

But, I assure him, that I positively stand on *solid ground*, and that my statement has been fortified by *historical facts* supplied by the Rig-Veda—the oldest and the most reliable literary monument¹ in the whole world—and found in the Literary achievements of the Hindus. For, we have a very beautiful picture in the Vaidik and other Sanskrit Literature, of the Village Councils or समित्तैः, of the Popular Assemblies or सभाः of Representative Elders, of the election of the king by the people or their representatives, of the great respect for the people during those times, of

1 In respect of this, Professor Max-Müller says thus:—
 “ In the present state of philological, historical, and philosophical research, no literary work was of greater importance and interest to the philologist, the historian, and philosopher, than the Veda, the oldest literary monument of the Indo European world”. (*Vide The Rig-Veda. Edited by Max-Müller. Vol. I, p V. Preface. Edition 1849.*)

In another place, the same learned Professor observes that, ‘The Rig-Veda is the most ancient book of the Aryan world’. “The sacred hymns of the Brāhmanas stand unparalleled in the literature of the whole world, and their preservation might well be called miraculous”. (*Rig-Veda. Vol. IV, p. LXXX.*)

He even calls the Vedas—“The spring heads of the thought, of the language, and of the poetry of India, which rise from depths inaccessible to foreign tributaries, and whose earliest course we may follow step by step in the literature of the Brāhmanas with greater accuracy than is the case in the early history of any other nation”. (*Rig-Veda, Vol. IV, p. LXXI. Vide also Max-Müller's remarks in his "History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature." Supra p 12.*)

the high esteem in which public opinion was then held, and of the power it wielded for the good of all, not to mention the robust spirit of Self-dependence of the times, and the love of labour with which every business was managed and executed.

I shall now endeavour to explain, on what solid foundation this *entire fabric of our Vedic Self-Government* was built up; how *the original seed* was sown; and under what circumstances these splendid results were achieved. Obviously, I would, for corroboration of facts, quote requisite texts from the Vaidik and Sanskrit Literature, which is not only very rich, but is also inexhaustible, and abounds in allusions to *our most interesting polity of yore.*

Now, in the infancy of our Aryan Society, *self-preservation and protection from injury*, nay from molestation or annoyance, constituted *the first and the foremost duty* of every one. Accordingly, both these were, in due time, secured; especially, as *self-preservation and protection*, jointly and severally, had become a sheer necessity. These, therefore, naturally developed *the spirit of the freedom of action* and of ardent passion for *self-control and independence*¹,

1 As regards this, Griffith says:—"In the Rik we find the people in a state of free activity and independence." (Vide "The Hymns of the Atharva-Veda". Translated. Vol. I. Preface, p V. Edition 1895).

amongst the members of the society. This, in turn, naturally gave rise to *love of Liberty* and *love of our country*; whose charms, therefore, I cannot better describe than in the words of the well-known Poets—Cowper and Sir Walter Scott. Says, Cowper, in respect of *the love of liberty* thus:—

“Freedom has a thousand charms to show,
That slaves, however contented, never know.
The mind that attains beneath her happy reign,
The growth that Nature meant she should attain.
The varied fields of science, ever new,
Opening and wider opening on her view
She ventures onward with a prosperous force
While no base fear impedes her in her course.

“Religion richest favour of the skies,
Stands most revealed before the freeman’s
eyes ;
No shades of superstition blot the day,
Liberty chases all that gloom away ;
The soul, emancipated, unoppressed,
Free to prove all things, and hold fast the best,
Learns much, and to a thousand listening minds
Communicates with joy the good she finds.
Courage in arms, and ever prompt to show
His manly forehead to the fiercest foe ;
Glorious in war, but for the sake of peace,

His spirits rising as his toils increase,
 Guards well what arts and industry have won,
 And freedom claims him for her first born son.
 Slaves fight for what were better cast away,
 The chain that binds them, and a tyrant's sway ;
 But they that fight for freedom, undertake,
 The noblest cause mankind can have at stake,
 Religion, virtue, truth, whatever we call
 A blessing, freedom is the pledge of all.

O Liberty ! the prisoner's pleasing dream
 The poet's muse, his passion and his theme,
 Genius is thine, and thou art fancy's nurse,
 Lost without thee the ennobling powers of verse;
 Heroic song from thy free touch acquires
 Its clearest tone, the rapture it inspires.
 Place me where winter breathes his keenest air,
 And I will sing if liberty be there ;
 And I will sing at liberty's dear feet,
 In Afric's torried clime or India's fiercest heat".

* * * * *

"Incomparable gem ! thy worth untold,
 Cheap, though blood-bought, and thrown away
when sold ;
 May no foes ravish thee, and no false friend
 Betray thee, while professing to defend ;
 Prize it ye ministers, ye monarches spare,

Ye patriots guard it with a miser's care" !
(Cowper's Table Talk).

In like manner, writes Sir Walter Scott with regard to *love of country*, as under :—

"Breathes there the man, with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land,
Whose heart hath ne'er within him burn'd,
As home his foot-steps he hath turned,
From wandering on a foreign strand !"

* * * *

(The Lay of the Last Minstrel. VI. I.)

Gradually, this *love of liberty* and *love of country*, generated, in the societies and the assemblies formed at the time, such unique feeling for their Aryan race, their kith and kin, their Aryan nation, and *their beloved Country*—Âryâvarta—otherwise known in the Vedic Period as *the Land of the Seven Rivers* (सप्तसिन्धवः),—that the same could be discerned in all their words and deeds, thoughts and actions. For, our hoary ancestors seem to have asked special favours for the Aryan *Autochthones in the Land*,¹ requested

1 In my work entitled "*The Aryâvartie Home and its Arctic Colonies—, or From Aryâvarta to the Arctic and from the Cradle to the Colony*," I have endeavoured to prove from all sources of evidence, that we Indo-Aryans are autochthonous in India, and *not immigrants* in the Land.

the Gods to make distinction between the sacrifice-loving Aryans and the irreligious Dasyus or the *Renegade Dissenters*, and solicited the boon of heroic sons for guarding and protecting the country from foreign inroads and civil wars, as I shall presently show *seriatim*.

And taking before others *self-preservation* and *self-protection*, having been the first in order, we find our ancestors invoking Indra with prayers, not only to save them from injuries which mortals would inflict on them, but also to protect them from slaughter, मा नो मर्ता अभिद्रुहन्तनूनामिन्द्र गिर्वजः । ईशानो यवया वधम् ॥ R. V. I. 5-10 ; to destroy those who were the objects of their hatred, or who hated them, यो नो द्वेष्ट्यधरः सस्यदीष्ट यमुद्विष्मस्तमू प्राणो जहातु ॥ R. V. III. 53.21 ; to drive away their enemies, पराणुदस्व मधवक्षमित्रान्..... R. V. VII 32.25 ; and to grant that no mighty foes, unknown, malevolent, or unhallowed, tread them to the ground, मा नो ऽभज्ञाता वृजना दुराधयो मा शिवासो ऽवक्रमुः ॥ R. V. VII. 32-27. Elsewhere, we observe prayers offered to Agni for preserving them from wicked mortals far and near, स नो दूराच्चासाच्च नि मर्त्यादधायोः । पाहि सदमिद्विश्वायुः ॥ R. V. I. 27-3, for saving them from danger, for burning down all evil spirits, for making them strong that they might live and move, ऊर्ध्वो नः पाह्यंहसो नि केतुना विश्वं समन्त्रिणे दह । कृधी न ऊर्ध्वान् चरथाय जीवसे..... ॥ R. V. I. 36-14, for protecting them from demons

and molestations of the enemy, as also from those who would injure or slay them, पाहि नो अग्ने रक्षसः पाहि धूर्तेररावणः । पाहि रीषत उत वा जिघ्रांसतो.....। R. V. I. 30-15. While, in another place, we see Rudra supplicated in a hundred and thousand ways, by our fore-fathers, not to slay the young or old amongst them, nor harm the growing child nor the full-grown man, the father, the mother, their dear persons, their babies, grand-children, servants, cows, horses, and heroes, in view of seeing that the whole wealth of the country was *well protected and kept secure*. मा नो महान्तमुत मा नो अर्भकं मा न उक्षन्तमुत मान उक्षितम् । मा नो वधीः पितरं मोत मातरं मा नः प्रिया स्तन्वो रुद्र रीरिषः ॥ R. V. I. 114-7 ; मा नस्तो-के तनये मा न आयौ मा नो गोषु मा नो अश्वेषु रीरिषः । वीरान्मा नो रुद्र भामितो वधीर्हविष्मन्तः सदमित्वा हवामहे ॥ R. V. I. 114-8.

We also find our Rig-Vedic fore-fathers, in another place, soliciting God Varuṇa to remove, far off from them, their enemies (वि षू मृधः शिश्रथः), and to confound their knavish tricks, in order that they (—our ancestors—) might live long, *may live in peace, to boot*.

वि षू मृधः शिश्रथो जीवसे नः ॥ ७ ॥

(Rig-Veda II. 28-7).

“Remove (our) enemies, that we may live.”
(S. P. Pandit).

Again, they prayed for freedom from harm (अतियेषं अरिष्टाः), and again they appear to have solicited the blessings of wide protection (उरावा शर्मन्त्स्याम) and peace.

अतियेषं रथेनारिष्टा उरावा शर्मन्त्स्याम ॥ १६ ॥
(R. V. II. 27. 16).

"May we, free from harm, be under your wide protection." (S. P. Pandit).

Nay, they had straightway asked for *strength*, as that covered everything, and was, they rightly considered, the chief source of protection and defence.

बलं धेहि तनुषु नो बलमिन्द्रानलुत्सु नः ।
बलं तोकाय तनयाय जीवसे त्वं हि बलदा
असि ॥
(R. V. III. 53. 18.)

But, more than this, we find not only *divine aid* asked, and *heavenly support* solicited, in the matter of *self-preservation* and *protection*, but our ancestors seem to have been actually prepared for both *the offensive* and *the defensive*, as they had asked from the Ribhus *wealth for war* (ऋभुराय सं शिशातु सार्ति.....R. V. I. 111. 5), for defence and onslaught, against the attacks of those who meant harm to, and destruction of them. Evidently, they gained what they had

1. Griffith renders this into English as follows:—"O Indra, give our bodies strength, strength to the bulls that draw the wain.

Strength to our seed and progeny that they may live, for thou art he who giveth strength."

prayed and fought for, with signal success, and their achievements in securing the blessings of peace certainly deserve the highest praise.

In short, *protection from injury*, that was fundamentally required for the preservation of order in, and the growth of, Society, having been primarily sought and finally *secured*, it was but a stepping-stone to further progress, to the individual unfettered action, and to the development of the robust spirit of *self-control* and *self-dependence*, as free expression seems to have been given to this spontaneous feeling in the verses of the Rig-Veda. For, we find prayers offered to Indra for the robust spirit in the attainment of wealth and glory, of food and horses, of divine grace and strength of valorous sons, in as much as all this materially served as but the means to an end, viz. *self-control*, *self-dependence*, and *freedom of action*, which our noble ancestors not only always *covetted*, but *ever enjoyed from their infancy*.

१अस्मान्तु तत्र चोदयेन्द्र राये रभस्वतः।

(R. V. I. 9. 6.)

२समिन्द्र राया समिषा रभेमहि

सं वाजेभिः पुरुश्चन्द्रैरभिद्युभिः।

सं देव्या प्रमत्या वीरशुष्मया

गो अग्रयाश्वावत्या रभेमहि ॥

(R. V. I. 53-5.)

1. "O Indra, stimulate us thereto, emulously fain for wealth." (Griffith).

2. "Let us obtain, O Indra, plenteous wealth and food, with strength exceeding glorious, shining to the sky." (Griffith).

"May we obtain (that) divine grace (which is) full of the strength of valorous sons, full of cattle, (and) full of horses. (S. P. Pandit).

This spirit of self-dependence. in our Rig-Vedic fore-fathers appears to have been too strong to be suppressed, and seems all along to have been *so rampant*, that in another place, apart from their own constant endeavours and vigilant care not to depend upon others for anything, even the Gods and the higher powers were asked to intervene in the matter, in their behalf, and to assist them. Nay, Varuṇa seems to have been actually supplicated by our Rig-Vedic Ancestors to make them free from their debts, and even to grant, that none of them ever fed himself on the gains of others.

पर ऋणा सावीरध मत्कृतानि

माहं राजन्नन्यकृतेन भोजम् । ...वरुण...॥

(R. V. II. 28. 9).

Moreover, elsewhere, we observe the sense of dependence on others *so repulsive to their feelings, so offensive to their self-respect, and so repugnant to their very high ideals*, that even God Varuṇa was solicited by earnest prayers to grant them the boon, that they might never declare their poverty, even to their rich relations, for getting wealth from them. In view, therefore, of avoiding this ridiculous position, and of attaining to that status where no want would be felt, they sought for *such wealth as could be kept under their control*, and also the gift of gallant sons.

माहं मघोनो वरुण प्रियस्य
 भुरिदान्व आ विदं शूनमापेः ।
 मा रायो राजन्त्सुयमादव
 स्थां बृहद्वदेम विदथे सुवीराः ॥ ७ ॥

(R. V. II. 29. 7).

“May I never tell, O Varuṇa, my poverty to a rich (and) bounteous dear relation. May I never be, O King, without controllable wealth. May we, accompanied by brave sons, chant great praises (of thee) in the Sacrifice.” (S. P. Pandit).

And, they had also offered prayers to grant, that they might not be under the yoke and control of the wicked.

मा नो दुःशंस ईशत ॥

(R. V. I. 23. 9)..

In another verse, there appear express prayers to say, that no mortal, who hated them (अस्मधुक्), or struck them with weapons at night (शिशीते अत्यक्तुभिः), should govern them (ईशत).

* * * * यो अस्मधुक् ।

योमर्त्यः शिशीते अत्यक्तुभिर्मा नः स रिपुरीशत ॥

(R. V. I. 36. 16).

In short, this deep rooted aversion to the state of depending upon, or under the yoke of,

others, and even the desire to earn and live by the sweat of their own brow, appears, beyond doubt, to be innate or natural in our Fore-fathers, and as such, above all praise. In fact, this seems to be a rich, not to say an *invaluable heritage*, received from our illustrious hoary ancestors, of which, by the bye, the vestiges and the *reflex* could be yet seen so late as, or say even during, the times of the Code of Manu. For, says he, "*Dependence upon others involves miseries, while reliance on our own self is the very source of happiness.*" The former, therefore, should be abandoned by means of great efforts, and the latter courted and sought with endeavours."

यद्यत्परवशं कर्म तत्तद्यत्नेन वर्जयेत् ।

यद्यदात्मवशं तु स्यात्तत्तत्सेवेत यत्नतः ॥ १५९ ॥

सर्वं परवशं दुःखं सर्वमात्मवशं सुखम् ।

एतद्विद्यात्समासेन लक्षणं सुखदुःखयोः ॥ १६० ॥

(मनुस्मृतिः । ४.१५९, १६०)

Now, this spirit of *self-dependence* having in time asserted itself, each day that dawned created fresh energies and infused new life into the veins of our Rig-Vedic ancestors. They were, therefore, naturally inclined to *be up and doing*, and to follow different professions and avocations in life, each according to his own taste and liking. Moreover, there was also a *real demand for all this*, and as such, a variety

of occupations was certainly required, for supplying countless wants of the entire community; especially, as innumerable interests were represented therein, and all shades of thoughts had to be carefully paid attention to. In the circumstances, we find our fore-fathers of yore engaged in various pursuits of life, of which some appear to have been actually mentioned in the Rig-Veda. For instance, one hymn of the Ninth Book says that, there are innumerable varieties of pursuits in which men are engaged (विवृतानि जनानां), and multifarious are their thoughts and plans in respect of several avocations in which they seem to be employed (नानानं वा उ नो धियो...). (R. V. IX. 112.1). It may, therefore, be remarked here in passing, that amongst the numberless pursuits that were in full swing during the hoary period of the Rig-Vedic Civilization, the study of sacrificial rites,¹ of philosophy,²—especially of the philosophy of

1. The sacrifices were considered by our Vedic Ancestors to be the *primeval germs* of religious ordinances and sacred duties. For, says the Rig-Veda:—यज्ञेन यज्ञमयजन्तदेवास्तानि धर्माणि प्रथमान्यासन्। (R. V. I. 164. 50).

2. In this respect, Professor Weber writes, "We have here a faithful copy of the Scholastic period of the Middle Ages; sovereigns whose courts form the centres of intellectual life; Brahmins who with lively emulation carry on their enquiries into the highest question the human mind can propound; women who with enthusiastic ardour plunge into the mysteries of speculation, impressing and astonishing men by the depth and loftiness of their opinions, and whosolve the questions proposed to them on sacred subjects." (History of Indian Literature, p. 22. Ed. 1882).

life, its origin, its end, and of the philosophy of the immortal soul,¹ (which has been supposed to be the *summum bonum of life*), of poetry,² of

And again he says, "several hymns of a speculative purport in the last book of the Rik-Sambhita, testify to a great depth and concentration of reflection upon the fundamental cause of things, necessarily implying a long period of philosophical research in a preceding age. This is borne out by the old renown of Indian Wisdom, by the reports of the companions of Alexander, as to the Indian gymnosophists," &c.....

(History of Indian Literature, by Albrecht Weber, p. 27-Ed. 1882).

1 को ददर्श प्रथमं जायमानमस्थन्वंतं यद्वनस्था विभर्ति । ॥ ४ ॥

"Who hath beheld him as he sprang to being, seen how the boneless One supports the bony"? (R. V. I. 164. 4). (Griffith).

००.....देवं मनः कुतो अधिप्रजातम् ॥ १८ ॥ (R. V. I-164-18).

"Whence hath the Godlike spirit had its rising"? (Griffith).

न विजानामि यदिवेदमस्मि निष्पद्यः संतद्धो मनसा चरामि ।

(R. V. I. 164.37).,

"What thing I truly am, I know not clearly; mysterious, fettered in my mind, I wander." (Griffith).

All this has been very beautifully and exhaustively explained in the Upanishads, in respect of which, therefore, Schopenhauer, one of the greatest philosophical critics, says, "In the whole world there is no study so beneficial and so elevating as that of the Upanishads. It has been the solace of my life—it will be the solace of my death." (Max Müller. What Can India Teach Us? p. 254. Ed. 1883). Sacred Books of the East. Vol. I. The Upanishads, Introduction. p lxi).

2. The intellectual life of this period was so stirring that even kings, queens, and princes took an active part in poetical compositions, as would be seen from Rig-Veda (I. 126; I. 100;), not to speak of other persons in the ordinary sphere of life. This, says Professor Weber, "accounts still further for the superiority maintained and exercised by the Bralmans over the rest of the people. Nor, did the military caste (क्षत्रियवर्ग) hold aloof from these inquiries, especially after they had succeeded in securing a time of repose from external warfare." (History of Indian Literature, pp. 21,22. Ed. 1882).

languages,¹ of astronomy,² of medicine,³ of anatomy,⁴

1 चत्वारिवाक् परिमितापदानि तानि विदुर्ब्राह्मणा ये मनीषिणः ।

गृहा त्रीणि निहिता नैगयन्ति तुरीयं वाचो मनुष्या वदन्ति ॥ ४९ ॥

"There are four forms of speech, and wise Brahmins only know them. Of those three are secret, and do not manifest themselves. While the fourth is what men speak." (R. V. I. 164. 45).

Professor Weber writes:—"The advance made by linguistic research during this epoch was very considerable."

"For the knowledge of Metre also, rich materials have been handed down to us in the Sūtras."

"To judge from a passage in the Kaushitaki Brāhmaṇa, linguistic research must have been carried on with peculiar enthusiasm in the North of India." (History of Indian Literature, pp. 22, 23, 26).

2. In respect of this, Professor Weber remarks that, 'astronomy was cultivated to a considerable extent even in Vedic times; and we found it expressly specified by Straboas a favourite pursuit of the Brahmins.....To the elaboration of a quinquennial cycle with an intercalary month, a pretty early date must be assigned, since the latter is mentioned in the Rik-Samhitā.' (History of Indian Literature, p. 246-7).

वेद मासो धृतवतो द्वादश म जावतः ।

वेदा य उपजायते ॥ (R. V. I. 25.8.)

3. Our fore-fathers of yore seem to be well-versed in the Science of Medicine. For, they were aware of many cures, as also of the *science of healing*, of numerous herbs and their efficacy, as will be seen from the following:—

R. V. I. 23. 16, 18, 19, 20; I. 191;

R. V. IX. 108. 1, 3, 9; IX. 109. 15;

R. V. X. 97. 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 17, 18, 19.

Professor Weber observes that during Vedic times medicine "must yet have enjoyed considerable cultivation." (History of Indian Literature, p. 29).

4. In respect of our *Anatomy*, Weber says, "Animal

of the science and art of *Music*,¹ of the *Dhanur-Veda* (धनुर्वेद) or the science of War,² of the formative or Technical Arts,³ and of other industrial pursuits in various branches, formed the chief sources of pleasure and employment.

It would certainly be very interesting to show, at this stage, by the very words of our

anatomy was evidently thoroughly understood, as each separate part had its own distinctive name," in the Vedic period. (Weber's History of Indian Literature. p 30. Vide also Rig-Veda I. 162.18. The sukta treats of the Horse-sacrifice, and the verse after mentioning 34 ribs of the horse, enjoins to name separate limbs and joints as they are cut.

1 "*Music* was from the very earliest times a favourite pursuit of the Hindus, as we may gather from the numerous allusions to musical instruments, in the Vedic literature." (Do. p 271).

गायति त्वं गायत्रिणो... (R. V. I.10.1).

Reference also seems to have been made in the Rig-Veda (I. 164-3) to the seven notes of the Musical scale, as explained by Sâyaṇa:—यत्र गवां निहिता सप्त नाम.....॥ (१-१६४-३).

2 "Besides Ayurveda-Medicine-the Hindus specify three other so called Upavedas—*Dhanur Veda*, *Gândharva-Veda*, and *Artha-Sâstra* ; i. e. the Art of War, Music, and the Formative Arts or Technical Arts generally ; and like Ayur-Veda, these terms designate the respective branches of literature at large, not particular works." (Weber's History of Indian Literature. p.271).

ancestors of the Tertiary¹ period, how by mere love of labour, they were wedded to the cause of self-reliance ; how by various sorts of pursuits, they had created in themselves immense zeal and taste for numerous arts and sciences ; how all these had become in time a mine of literary wealth, richer than that of any nation in the world, and "more," says Professor Max-Müller, "than the whole classical literature of Greece and Italy put together"²; how this had generated free thought and freedom of action ; how these had gradually budded into a robust spirit of self-dependence ; and how, finally, the unbounded love of Âryāvarta—the renowned Land of the Seven Rivers—was consummated and raised to the highest ideal of Patriotism.

For, there are, I venture to state, some verses in the Rig-Veda, which pointedly refer to this state of things. Because, we find it mentioned in Hymn 112 of Book IX, that there were innumerable professions, crafts, and pursuits, which each individual followed according to his taste, liking, and means. For facility of reference, I subjoin the original text with its English translation:—

(1) नानानं वा उ नो धियो विव्रतानिजनानाम्।

तक्षा रिष्टं रुतं भिषग्ब्रह्मा सुन्वन्तामिच्छति...॥१॥

1. Vide my work "The Aryāvartie Home, and its Arctic Colonies." pp 19, 29, 151, 156, 380-401, 464-468, 470, 471, 476, 487, 488.

2. Vide What can India teach us ? p 84. Ed. 1883.

(2) जरतीभिरोषधीभिः पर्णैभिः शकुनानां।

कामारो अश्मभिर्द्युभिर्हिरण्यवंतामिच्छति ॥ २ ॥

(3) कारुरहं ततोभिषगुपलप्रक्षिणीनना।

नानाधियो वसूयवोऽनुगा इव तस्थिम.... ॥ ३ ॥

(4) अश्वो वोळ्हा सुखं रथं हसनामुपमंत्रिणः ॥४॥

(R. V. IX. 112-1 @ 4).

(1) "We all have various thoughts and plans, and diverse are the ways of men.

The Brâhman seeks the worshipper, wright seeks the cracked, and leech the maimed."

(2) "The smith with ripe and seasoned plants, with feathers of the birds of the air,

With stones, and with enkindled flames, seeks him who hath a store of gold".....

(3) "A bard am I, my dad's a leech, mammy lays corn upon the stones.

Striving for wealth, with varied plans, we follow our desires like kine".....

(4) "The horse would draw an easy car, gay hosts attract the laugh and jest"...(Griffith).

Evidently, the Brâhman, studying the sacrificial rites and following the profession of a Priest, naturally desired sacrificers, and was always busy in search of them (ब्रह्मा सुन्वन्त-मिच्छति). The Doctor, or the physician and

the surgeon, invariably sought the indisposed and the maimed (रुतं भिषक्). The carpenter or the wright searched for the cracked (तक्षारिष्टं). The artisans with ripe and seasoned plants, as also with feathers of birds and shining stones, were ever after the rich, in order that they might order a variety of things manufactured by them (जरती-भिरोषधीभिः पर्णेभिः शकुनानां । कामारो ऽ अश्वभि-द्युभिर्हिरण्यवन्तमिच्छति..... R. V. IX. 112.2).

While, the bard of the period, named Shishu, of the Angiras family and the Composer of the hymn, declared that he himself was a *poet* (कारुरहं), that his father was a *physician* (ततो भिषक्), and that his mother was busy in domestic affairs, such as pounding rice, laying corn, &c, (उपल-प्रक्षिणी नना). In like manner, others desiring wealth were also engaged in different pursuits of life,—each according to his own taste. (नानाधियो वसूयवो.....R. V. IX. 112.3).

Thus, in connection with the aforesaid innumerable pursuits, these and other scattered verses in the Rig-Veda seem to be of the utmost importance, and therefore invite our special attention. For, they among other things, not only show the high patriotic feeling of our Rig-Vedic ancestors (ante pp 60-68), but exhibit in a pre-eminent degree their breadth of views, their deep love of science and Art (supra pp 64-69), and the means they had taken for their cultivation

and encouragement, in view of not, by any means, neglecting them in the least. To take but one instance for elucidation, I quote herein-below a verse from that matchless mine of literary wealth, as the same will certainly repay perusal.

यत्रौषधीः समग्मत राजानः समिताविव ।

विप्रः स उच्यते मिषग्रक्षोहा मविचातनः ॥ ६ ॥

(R. V. X. 97.6).

This may be freely rendered into English as follows:—"He who hath store of Herbs, (that are brought together) like Kings who meet in their Councils and Assemblies (for discussing Public questions), deserves the title of, and is therefore called, a *Doctor*, as he is the chaser of diseases, and is the fiend-slayer."

Important as this quotation is, it unquestionably proves two things, simultaneously. Firstly, that distinct encouragement was offered for the spread and cultivation of Science and Art, by giving honorary titles, such as मिषग्रक्ष (Doctor), &c; and secondly, that during the Vedic times, there was, it appears, *Constitutional Monarchy*, as kings were then apparently governed by the opinions of the *Village Communes* or *Councils* and of *Popular Assemblies*, which evidently were but Representative Bodies (*ante pp 18,22,48,51, and next Chapter III*), and these, it seems, he had to attend. But, of this anon, as we shall have occasion to refer, in detail, to the

subject of *Public Opinion* and our miniature Republics, the Popular Assemblies and the Village Communities, in the Brâhminic Polity, later on.

We have thus found, that our Vedic ancestors having had good many avocations and innumerable pursuits, owing to their love of labour, freedom of action, and the great demand for them, they were enabled to stand on their own legs, which naturally created *Self-confidence* in them. This, therefore, in course of time, expanded their vision, increased the sphere of their influence, and naturally made them ambitious. Consequently, they gradually coveted power for asserting their beneficial influence over others, and this only served as but the means to an end. For instance, in one verse, they seem to have actually asked for power and rule over men, accompanied with glory, wealth, great renown, and mighty strength.

अस्मे सोम श्रियमधि नि धेहि शतस्य नृणाम् ।

महि श्रवस्तु विवृम्णम् ॥ (R. V. I. 43.7).

“O Soma, give unto us power and rule over a hundred men, combined with mighty strength and great renown.”

In another place, they have prayed for the subjection of, and for bringing under their yoke, the vulgar races.

* * * नैचाशखं मघवन् रंधया नः ॥ १४ ॥

(R. V. III. 53.14).

“Bring under our rule, oh Maghavan, the Naichashākhas or the vulgar races, and the low born.”

While elsewhere, we observe our forefathers soliciting the deified Ribhus, for the favour of that pre-eminently honourable authority and unique strength (तं वाजं चित्रं), whereby they might attain the foremost rank, and outshine all.

येन वयं चितयेमात्यन्यान्

तं वाजं चित्रमृभवो ददा नः ॥ ९ ॥

(R. V. IV. 36.9).

“Give us, O Ribhus, that honourable (unique) authority (or power), with which we may eclipse others.” (S. P. Pandit).

Now, this desire of our Vedic Ancestors, for control and for Government of their country, having by degress been fulfilled, the strong and yet beneficent rule of our ancestors made them a very powerful nation, as it vindicated the foremost claim for protection of person, preservation of property, spread of education, and cultivation of Arts and Sciences, consequent upon the prevalence of profound peace throughout the length and breadth of the Land of the Seven Rivers. This raised them to greatness, and naturally created a belief in them that they were the chosen People of God, and as such were

entitled to distinction. For, they seem to have given free expression to this very powerful feeling, by soliciting Indra to distinguish between the Aryás—the faithful worshippers—that performed sacrifices, and the Dasyus that were irreligious (अव्रतान्). They had also prayed for punishing the latter, and bringing them under the yoke and authority of the former.

विजानीद्यार्यान्वे¹ च दस्यवो¹

बहिष्मते रन्धया शासदव्रतान् ।

(R. V. I. 51-8).

“Discern thou well Aryas¹ and Dasyus¹; punishing the lawless, give them up to him whose grass is strewn (that is, the faithful Aryan worshipper).”

This obviously seems to be the expression of *the legitimate pride* of our race; and it seems to have been naturally evinced by our ancient Sires. In like manner, even *the spirit of self-dependence*, and *hankering after freedom of action or love of liberty*, appear to have been *oft displayed* (*vide ante pp 60-64*). While, as to the *deep love* in respect of *our great and ever dear country*—Aryavarta—the whole of our *colossal Sanscrit Literature*—both Vedic and *post-Vedic*

1 As to Aryas, Dasyus, Dāsas, Asuras, and Rākshasas, I have given full details in my work “The Aryāvartie Home and Its Arctic Colonies.” Chapter XI. pp 257 @ 315. (The Author.)

—affords but distinct indications, everywhere. I therefore venture to give here a few specimens of the same, the grandeur and pathos of which *can scarcely be equalled, much less surpassed.*

Firstly then, we find that, Aryâvarta is in spirit and in a wider sense, the Region of the river Sarasvatî, which, in Vedic times, was known as the *Land of the Seven¹ Rivers*, having been chiefly watered and inundated by these rivers. Of these seven¹ rivers, the Sarasvatî was *pre-eminently the first and the foremost*. For, she was considered to be *the most divine* (असुर्या नदीनाम् R. V. VII. 96. 1), and *the most sacred of all streams* (पावका नः सरस्वती) R. V. I. 3. 10). Moreover, she was even deemed to be *the very scene of vitality*, as it was in this river that *life had first² commenced³* (त्वे विश्वा सरस्वति श्रितायूषि देव्याम् R. V. II. 41. 17). She was, therefore, very naturally designated as *the best of Mothers* (अंबितमे), *the best of Rivers* (नदीतमे), and *the best of Goddesses³* (देवितमे); while, even “her Himâlaya⁴ Mountains,” that form the northern

1. The Seven Rivers are as follows:—(1) The Ganges, (2) the Jamna, (3) the Sarasvatî, (4) the Satlaj (Shutudri), (5) the Râvi (Parushni or Irâvati), (6) the Chenâb (Chandrabhâgâ or Asikni), and (7) the Indus (Sindhu).

2. Vide my works—

(a) *The Vedic Fathers of Geology.* pp 99 @ 103.

(b) *The Aryavartian Home and its Arctic Colonies.* pp 7, 12, 13, 26, 27.

3. Rig-Veda. II. 41.16 ;

4. Rig-Veda X. 121. 4.

boundary of the Land of the Seven Rivers, have been extolled and declared as having had their share in singing the praises and the greatness of Him, *who is the One Unknowable* (—यस्येमे हिमवन्तो महित्वा.....आहुः।), who is the God of all Gods, and who is the Lord of this endless Universe.

Moreover, we further find that, this region of the river Sarasvatî was called *the God-fashioned Region* (योनिं देवकृतं † R. V. III. 33. 4), and the fact seems to have been reiterated, *evidently by traditional remembrance*, and the conclusion immensely fortified by an express allusion to it in the Mahâ-Bhârata and the Manu Smṛiti, both of which describe the same as the *God-fashioned-tract* (देवनिर्मितं देशं † M.Bh. XIV. 110. 44 ; M. Smr. II. 17).

Of this Region,—viz., the *God-created one*, the river Sarasvatî was, in the very nature of things, *the Mother*, as indicated before (*anti p.* 75) ; and she having, with the greatest care, *nourished and fed* her sons and daughters, *the children of the soil*—, she was ever eulogized, extolled, and invoked with *the tenderest* of feelings by our Rig-Vedic Poets, with solicitations “ *Never to refuse her milk* ” to them—(सरस्वति पयसा मा न आधृक्). Nay, she seems to have been verily asked with earnestness to give them her glorious treasures, and even “ to kindly condescend to accept their *attachment* and obedi-

ence to her." She was, again, requested to be graciously pleased to confer on them the favour of very kind treatment at her hands, and never allow them to *suffer separation, or to go away from her to distant climes.*" (*Vide Rig-Veda. VI. 61.14*). This certainly will speak for itself, in respect of the *great love and extremely touching sentiments* as regards our Mother of Mothers—the Sarasvatî and *her region*, to which our Vedic Fathers had given expression in the Rig-Veda:—

सरस्वत्यमिनो नेषि वस्यो मा पस्फरीः पयसा
मा न आचक्र ।

जुषस्व नः सख्या वेद्या च मा त्वत्क्षेत्राण्यरणानि
गन्म ॥ १४ ॥

(Rig-Veda. VI. 61.14).

"Guide us Sarasvatî, to glorious treasures, refuse us not thy milk, nor spurn us from thee.

Gladly accept our friendship and obedience, let us not go from thee to distant countries." (R. T. H. Griffith).

Besides, we see that, it was owing to *the favour* of the Sarasvatî, that our Vedic Forefathers and their ancestors were able *to extend their Empire and the colonies of the Mother-country, within and even beyond the confines of the region of the Sarasvatî or the Land of the Seven Rivers.* And the fact obviously appears in bold

relief in the Rig-Veda, as it is here that our Vedic Ancestors seem to have given free vent to their spontaneous feelings, nay, genuine and the kindest regards for the Sarasvatî. For, says the Rik Poet thus:—

सा नो विश्वा अतिद्विषः स्वसृरन्या ऋतावरी।

अतन्नहेव सूर्यः ॥ (Rig-Veda. VI. 61.9).

“She (the river Sarasvatî) hath spread us *beyond all foes, (and) even beyond her sisters*”—(that is to say, beyond the other six rivers, which, together with the Sarasvatî, constitute the सप्तसिन्धवः, or the renowned Seven Rivers of Âryâvarta); “as Sûrya spreadeth out the days.”

But, more than this, the river Sarasvatî is said to have even *procured for, and given land* to, our *Primitive Aryan Ancestors*, who, therefore, have described *her suckling breast*, or rather *her watery bed*, as the *exhaustless spring* and *fountain-source of pleasure*, the *feeder of the choicest things*, the *giver of wealth*, &c, as the Rik verses will show: (Rig-Veda. VI. 61-3 ; I. 164.49).

Thus, every thing made the river Sarasvatî, *all in all to us*. Nay, owing to this fact, she was even considered by our Rig-Vedic ancestors to be *the dearest of the ever dear to them*, viz the *Seven Renowned rivers* of Aryâvarta. They,

therefore, appear to have naturally given vent to *this feeling of love and endearing thought*:—

उत नः प्रिया प्रियासु सप्तस्वसा सुजुष्टा
सरस्वती स्तोम्याभूत् ॥ ऋ० वे० ६.६१.१०

“Yea, she most dear amid dear streams,
Seven-sistered, graciously inclined Sarasvatî has
earned our praise.”

In short, in respect of the river Sarasvatî and her region, we observe *such traditional familiarity of our Primitive Ancestors, such intimate acquaintance with her vast region and its surroundings, such deep gratitude for all the favours showered upon the land by her, such copious out-burst of reverence for her, such natural tenderness of feeling for her, and even such innate love of and affection for her and her region, as can only be traced by their indelible stamp, almost every where, in that most ancient document—the Rig-Veda.*

But, the Rig-Veda is not the only literary work which reveals to us *such intense love, on the part of our ancient ancestors, in respect of the great region and the country.* Since, we find the same feeling of *patriotism* predominating even in other Vedic works and Sanskrit literature, the passages from which, therefore, we shall place before the Reader for his conviction, and for facility of reference.

In the Atharva-Veda, our Aryāvarta or *the Land of the Seven Rivers*, seems to have claimed special mention, in respect of every thing—either animate or inanimate—*her ocean and the Indus* (यस्यांसिंधुः), *her supply of water and even her food-grains*; nay, all that breathes and moves (XII. 1.3); the Land that bears plants endowed with varied power and strong medicinal qualities (नानावीर्या ओषधीर्या विभर्ति XII. 1.2); the Land where our ancestors of old, before us battled, and where Devas (Gods) attacked Asuras (XII. 1.5); the Land, on the Forests, hills, and snow-clad mountains of which, blessings were solicited (गिरयस्ते पर्यता हिमवन्तोऽरण्यं ते पृथिवि स्योनमस्तु। XII. 1.11); the Land, where men sang and danced with varied shouts and noise, where they even fought, and where the war-cry and drum resounded (XII. 1.41); the Land, moreover, of *Six Seasons* and of equal days and nights (XII. 1.36).

Now, in the Vishnu Purāṇa,¹ this love of

1. In respect of the antiquity of this and a few other Purāṇas, Colebrooke—the great Oriental Scholar—says that, “Itihās and Purāṇas are anterior to Vyāsa,” the author of the Great Epic—the Mahā-Bhārata. (*Vide* Colebrooke’s Miscellaneous Essays. Vol I. p 11).

Professor Wilson also, another Oriental Scholar known to fame, speaks of the genuineness and great antiquity of some Purāṇas, including the Vishnu Purāṇa, as follows:—

“A very great portion of the contents of many (Purāṇas), some portion of the contents of all, is genuine and old.” (*Vide* Vishnu Purāṇa. Preface. p VI)-

our country and the feeling of affection for it, has probably reached its climax and intensity. For, obviously enough, the Vishnu Purâna has even marked out *the continent of India* as *superior to all* (अत्रापि भारतं श्रेष्ठं। II. 3.22). As it says that, one is born *here* as a human being, *only by means of his merits* (कदाचिह्रमते जन्तु-मानुष्यं पुण्यसंचयात्), after thousands of births in innumerable forms of existence (अत्र जन्मसहस्राणां सहस्रैरपि सत्तम। V. P. II. 3.23).

Moreover, the blessings showered on Aryâvarta of which our ancestors were ever proud, have also been tersely described by adding that, "even the Gods sing in eulogy the happiness enjoyed *in this Land*," and loudly declare that, "*the persons born in Bhârata-Varsha are the most fortunate*" (धन्यास्तु ते भारतभूमिभागे। भवन्ति भूयः पुरुषाः.....॥ V. P. II. 3.24). And lastly, in the same strain, *the hankering-after birth in this land* has been made manifest, by making a very anxious query as to "where shall we be born again, after our *karma* is over, that gives enjoyment of happiness in heaven"? (जानीम नैतत् क्व वयं विलीने॥ स्वर्गप्रदे कर्माणि देहवन्धं प्राप्स्यामः।); but exhibiting the strongest desire, *in unmistakable language*, to have *the good luck in store, to be born again in Bhârata-Varsha*. Since, it seems to have been expressed in clear terms that, those are *really happy and blessed, that*

live in *Bhârata-Varsha*, fully endowed with all the organs of senses (.....धन्याः खलु ते मनुष्याः । ये भारते नेन्द्रियविप्रहीनाः ॥ *Vide* Vishnu Purâna II. 3.26).

In the Mahâ-Bhârata again, we find Kurukshetra (कुरुक्षेत्र) actually called *the very Heaven on Earth* (ये वसन्ति कुरुक्षेत्रे ते वसन्ति त्रिविष्टपे ॥ M. Bh. III. 81.205). While, in passages that are afloat in our Sanskrit Literature and in the Subhâshita, it seems to have been observed, with all the *pathos* and the *kindest* of feelings, that "It is *very difficult*, perhaps rare, to obtain birth in *Bharatakhanda*, and more so as a human being" (दुर्लभं भारते जन्ममानुष्यं तत्र दुर्लभम् ।).

Obviously, all this evinces extreme love of, nay, great reverence and fond affection for, our Mother-country—Aryâvarta—, and exhibits, in its most charming form, *noble* patriotism in all its aspects.

1. As a matter of fact, our Bhârata-Varsha is really so very charming. Nay, it has been endowed with all the gifts of Nature, and even her choicest boons. If, however, the Reader thinks that either my humble self or my revered ancestors have exaggerated the fact, I beg to place before him the testimony of so *crudite*, so *well-informed*, and so *well-known* a scholar, as Professor Max-Müller. For, says he, "If I were to look over the whole world to find out the country most richly endowed with all the wealth, power, and beauty, that nature can bestow—in some parts a very paradise on earth—I should point to India." (*Vide*. "India. What can it teach us"? p 6. Edition 1883).

In the light of these facts, and with the overwhelming evidence adduced heretofore, it would certainly be idle to say that, our ancient ancestors or the hoary sons of Ind had *no idea, in the least, of patriotism*, of the love of their country, or of self-dependence, and were also *ignorant of the love of liberty*. However, surprisingly enough, and all this evidence notwithstanding, we notice the very strange fact of many Occidentals and even Orientals affirming with an air of scorn, that there is absolutely nothing in India, which, anywhere exhibits *love of the country, of freedom of action, of self-dependence, and of self-sacrifice*.

Evidently, this is owing to deep ignorance of our Sanskrit and even our Vernacular¹ Literature,

1. (a) To take a few instances from our Marāthi Literature, we find the great Poet Mayūra warbling as follows:—

काराचि बरी निरयगति परवशता शतगुणे करी जाच ।

(b) Our great saint and Poet Rāmdās is another instance of the kind, and Dāsa-Bodha-his much perused and revered work-breathes patriotism, love of our country, and love of our nation, every where:—

अखंड सावधान असावे ॥ दुश्चित कदापि नसावे ॥

(c) As a third instance of the kind, I venture to quote a couple of lines from the work of our another great Poet Mukteshvar, the *patriotic pathos, grandeur, and majesty* of which can scarcely be found in the Literature of any other country or nation. Says he,

महाराष्ट्र जें सर्व राष्ट्रासि राजे ।

अपाच्या भये व्यापिले देव लाजे ॥

perusal of which would make manifest to any one that, *patriotism*, or for the matter of that, love of country and of liberty as well, like every thing else, is the growth of *this land*. Nay, it will bring conviction home to him that, *the same* is an *indigenous plant* in India, and *not at all exotic or foreign to the soil*.

Perhaps, for the benefit of the Reader, I may, with advantage, quote here a few passages from the work of the late lamented Honourable Justic Ranade, as these will corroborate me in material particulars. Writes the learned scholar and writer as follows:—"This feeling of patriotism illustrates most forcibly the characteristic result of the formation of a nation in the best sense of the word, and constitutes another reason, why the History of the Marathas deserves special study." p 8.

"It was a higher moral force which brought out all the virtues of the best men of the (Maratha) nation—daring heroism, noble endurance, administrative skill, a hope which rose higher with every disappointment, a faith which was never shaken, devotion to a high ideal, which was independent of time, place, or person, a sense of brotherhood in common danger, a spirit of complete self-sacrifice, and mutual concession for the common good, a trust in the final success of their cause." * * * * pp 194, 195.

“These were the virtues which enabled the (*Maratha*) patriots of this generation to accomplish the deliverance of their country from a danger which no other race in India had been able to withstand.” p. 195. (*Vide* Rise of the Maratha Power. By the late Honourable Justice M. G. Ranade. Edition 1900.)

Probably, our contact with the West, having made us familiar *only* with the choice English and European Literature, we have greedily devoured all that it contained, to the *exclusion of*, and even to the *throwing away with contempt in the back-ground*, all that has been bequeathed to us in the shape of *our Literature*; when, justly speaking, *this* should have *rightly claimed our first attention*.

The result has naturally been that, more is known to us at present about the Literature of the West; and this exhibits to our view much of its science and art, of patriotism and love of liberty, of freedom of action and spirit of self-dependence, and even of independence; thereby giving us to understand that there is absolutely nothing of the kind in the Literature of the East, and even of Ind, although the latter has been traditionally believed, from very ancient times, and through Greek and other foreign sources, nay, proverbially supposed, to be *the fathomless*

*repository*¹ of great wisdom and learning, in all its important branches.

This, ignorance therefore, in the very nature of things, makes many of us conclude that, West alone, and not the East, is the source of all things aforesaid, and even of all knowledge, when, as a matter of fact quite the reverse has really been the case.

Here, therefore, I believe, it would not be out of place to parenthetically observe that, it is not only the West that has any peculiar and special claims to *love of Liberty*, to *love of one's own country*, or even to Science and Art. Since, it obviously appears to be the *common property* of both the East and the West. Nay, if everything comes from the *East*; if, as remarked by Max-Muller, "all that we value most has come to us from the East" (*ante p.* 26); if, as Ockley writes, "the genial rays" of the East, "ripen the wits of the Eastern nations" (*ante p.* 33); and if, as I have shown in the sequel, the evidence from *analogy* and the unimpeachable testimony of the colossal Sanskrit Literature¹

1 In this respect, vide the remarks made above by Sir William Jones and Sir Monier Williams (*ante pp.* 13,14.)

Moreover, Max-Muller frankly declares that, "the number of separate works in Sanskrit, of which MSS. are still in existence, amounts to about 10,000" (Hibbert¹ Lectures p 133). This is more, I believe, than the whole classical

of this vast continent of India, which places before us ready information on a variety¹ of subjects, has corroborated the fact in material particulars, then I say, there appear strong grounds to argue and even to maintain that, the West had, as a matter of fact, *primarily obtained the germs of all knowledge from the very East*. Because, while on the one hand, our great Epic—the Mahâ-Bhârata—(XIV. 110. 47) as also the Code of Manu (II. 20), evince the spread of knowledge, in all directions, from Âryāvarta

literature of Greece and Italy put together." (*Vide* India. What can it teach us ? p 84. Edition 1883:).

1 As regards this, Max-Muller has plainly written to the effect that, "You will find yourselves every where in India between an immense past and an immense future, with opportunities such as the old world could but seldom if ever, offer you. Take any of the burning questions of the day—popular education, higher education, parliamentary representation, codification of laws, finance, emigration, poor-law, and whether you have any thing to teach and to try, or anything to observe and to learn, India will supply you with a laboratory such as exists nowhere else." ° ° ° ° p 14.

"And in that study of the history of the human mind, in that study of ourselves, of our true selves, India occupies a place second to no other country. Whatever sphere of the human mind you may select for your special study, whether it be language, or religion, or mythology, or philosophy, whether it be laws or customs, primitive art or primitive science, everywhere you have to go to India, whether you like it or not, because some of the most valuable and most instructive materials in the history of man are treasured up in India, and in India only." (*Vide* "India. What can it teach us" ? pp 14-15. Edition 1883).

itself, which, during ancient times, was actually *the Centre of Learning*, and obviously *the scene of all activities*, as will be presently shown ; the Vedas and our fathomless Sanskrit Literature, on the other hand, contain many distinct indications in respect of the above fact, and even manifest here and there *the legitimate pride of our race*, the *enviable love of our country*, and *the hankering after freedom of action or love of liberty*, (supra pp 60 @ 64,74), which evidently had found their way *along with our emigrations abroad, from Âryâvarta*, East and West, North and South. (Vide my work *The Âryâvartic Home and its Arctic Colonies*. Chapter XIV. pp 379 @ 428 ; and below pp 89,90).

In the circumstances, ryâvarta naturally seems to have enjoyed for years, nay for centuries, the privilege of having given to the West, along with other things, *even the first lessons in Patriotism*, which may briefly be said to include, among other things, *the legitimate pride of one's race*, *the love of one's country*, and *the hankering after freedom of action or love of liberty*, as will be seen from the sequel. For instance, in the Mahâ-Bhârata, it has been plainly stated that, "From a Brahman born in this region (that is, Âryâvarta—एतदेशप्रसूतस्य सकाशादग्रजन्मनः), all men on Earth (पृथिव्यां सर्वमानवाः) should receive their lessons, in all that concerns their actions in life" [स्वं चरित्रं च

(शिक्षेरन्) गृहणीयुः] *Vide* M. Bh. XIV. 110. 47 ; South Indian Texts Edition. And, even in the Code of Manu (मनुस्मृ० II. 20), almost the same thing seems to have been reiterated, which, therefore, strongly corroborates and confirms the fact, nay fortifies the conclusion, that we—the Indo-Aryan *autochthones* in Âryâvarta—were but the *Pioneers of civilization and of the spread of knowledge every where* ; especially, as both the Epic and the Code declare with emphasis that, *the Region* (of the Sarasvati) has had its own *hoary traditions and customary usages* (तस्मिन्देशे य आचारः पारंपर्यक्रमागतः), which, moreover, have been supposed to be genuine and *the only pure usages* of the country (स सदाचार उच्यते ।). *Vide* M. Bh. XIV. 110. 45 ; M. Smr. II. 18).

But, more than this, the fact that Âryâvarta or India has ever been *the source of knowledge*, has been *admitted* and never gainsaid, by even Occidental scholars, whose evidence, therefore, I beg to adduce in view of fortifying my conclusions, as it would, I think, be opportune and not out of place, here to do so. For, says Professor Heeren as follows :—"India is the source from which not only the rest of Asia but the whole Western World derived their knowledge and their religion " (*vide* Historical Researches, Vol. II. p. 45). In like manner, the observations of Count Bjornstjerna also deserve notice (*vide* supra p. 36).

Again, Cruiser, an eminent French *Savant*, writes, as regards this, in unequivocal language, thus :—"If there is a country on earth which can justly claim the honour of having been the cradle of the human race, or at least *the scene of primitive civilization*, the successive developments of which carried into all parts of the ancient world, and even beyond, the blessings of knowledge which is the second life of man, that country assuredly is India."

Moreover, M. Louis Jacolliot has emphatically declared that, "India is the world's cradle ; thence it is, that the common Mother in sending forth her children even to the utmost West, has, in unfading testimony of our origin, bequeathed us the legacy of her language, her laws, her *morale*, her literature, and her religion." (*Vide La Bible Dans L'Inde. p VII. Edition 1870*).

And last but not least, Professor Max-Müller remarks with great stress, "If I were to ask myself from what literature we, here in Europe, we who have been nurtured almost exclusively on the thoughts of Greeks and Romans, and of one Semitic race, the Jewish, may draw that corrective which is most wanted in order to make our inner life more perfect, more comprehensive, more universal, in fact more truly human, a life, not for this life only, but a transfigured and

eternal life—again I should point to India.”
(*Vide* “India. What can it teach us ? p. 6
Edition 1883).

In the circumstances, if even Occidental Scholars and leaders of thought, consider India and India only to be the source of all knowledge and learning, it is but natural that our ancient ancestors should have thought this land of their birth and achievements, to be *the primeval seat of Literary Wealth* ; and that it was from this place that knowledge had spread every where and even to the West, which therefore was indebted for it to the East, and especially to Âryāvarta or the Land of the Seven Rivers, where during the Rig-Vedic Period and even before, there was thus a marvellous development of the germs of knowledge, of Political Institutions, of the powers of organisation, of Science and Art, of Religion and Philosophy, of *Self-reliance* and *Self-sacrifice*, of the Love of country and of Liberty, of the love of Law and order, of the great respect for authority and Sovereign-power.

CHAPTER III.

The Vedic Village Community, The Popular Assembly,

AND

The Ancient Constitutional Monarchy.

During the infancy of our Vedic Ind, we had, in our Âryāvarta of the hoary past, small assemblies in the beginning. But, these were sacrificial or religious assemblies only at first, known as विद्वथ (*Vide ante p. 47*), and in them were discussed questions relating to the *technique* of ceremonials, placed before them by Patriarchs, who were not only the recognised heads of families, but were also the *Village Elders*, that had social position, influence, and respect. For, Religion and sacrificial rites, in the very nature of things, had played an important part in our affairs of the Vedic times, and as such, prominence was, given to their discussion, at first. This, however, was, according to necessity, followed by topics on social subjects, or by those that had reference to the needs of the village, and the various wants of the community; which, therefore, duly engaged the attention of the Elders in the Assembly (विद्वथे, समितौ, सभायां), &c.

It was naturally the desire of every one to ensure the greatest good to all, and this could only be secured by fair representation of the

varied interests. Samiti (समिति) or *the Village Commune*, and Sabhâ (सभा) or *the Popular Assembly* were, therefore, formed, and every effort was made to introduce therein the essential elements of representation, for looking to the comforts of all, and giving due respect to all shades of thought (*Vide supra pp.* 22, 23, 47, 48, 50, 51). We must, however, admit that we have no means to ascertain on what principle this *representation* was based, during the Vedic period. But, probably, this important franchise depended upon great opulence, large property, cattle, steeds, and wealth of heroic sons. For, that seems to be the very thing for which prayers were frequently made, and Gods as also heavenly Powers often solicited and even propitiated. To take only one instance for elucidation of facts, we find Indra supplicated in the following first verse for plenteous wealth (राया समिषा रभेमहि), for extensive live-stock of cattle and steeds (वाजेभिः पुरुश्चन्द्रैरभिद्युभिः।...गोअग्रया.), and for strength of heroic sons (वीरशुष्मया); while in III. 1.23; III. 5.11; III. 23-5; &c, of the Rig-Veda, land (इळाम्) full of valorous deeds is asked, as also cattle (गोः).

समिन्द्र राया समिषा रभेमहि

संवाजेभिः पुरुश्चन्द्रैरभिद्युभिः ।

संदेव्या प्रमत्या वीरशुष्मया

1. Mr. Griffith translates this verse as under:—"Let us obtain, O Indra, plentious wealth and food, with strength exceeding glorious, shining to the sky: May we obtain the Goddess Providence, the strength of horses, special source of cattle, rich in steeds."

गोअग्रया भ्वावत्या रमेमाहि ॥ ५ ॥

(R. V. I. 53.5).

‘इष्टामग्ने पुरुवंसं सर्नि गोः शश्वत्तमं हव-
मानाय साध । (R. V. III. 1.23).

We might even cite innumerable examples of the kind. But limited space at our disposal forbids us to do so. Evidently, great riches, large properties, and immense wealth, comprising cattle, steeds, and heroic sons in the family, appear, as usual, to have secured the desired social position ; and such heads of families only, as could command these resources, were probably allowed to represent the family, the tribe, or the clan, in the *Village-Commune* or Council, called *समिति*, for all practical purposes. While, the Representatives chosen by the *Samitis* or the Village Communities formed the Vedic Sabhâ (*सभा*) or the Popular Assembly of the entire Nation of the Vedic Period. (*Vide supra pp 47, 50. Foot-notes*).

Be that as it may, the formation of these important public bodies, and even due *representation* therein of all shades of thought and variety of interests involved, such as was then thought feasible and sufficient, were considered to be but *desiderata*, even at that early period of our existence. It, therefore, becomes, in the

1. Mr. S. P. Pandit renders this into English thus:—

“O Agni, ever and ever do thou procure for thy worshipper land full of many valorous deeds, and an affluence of cows.”

very nature of things, a legitimate matter for further enquiry and even of curiosity to see, how our foresighted Ancestors of the Vedic period had deemed, and rightly too, that it was *union itself* that was the chief, nay the real source of strength ; how endeavours were made in right earnest, for the achievement of that which was supposed to be a sheer necessity ; and how wiser counsels had prevailed in respect of securing all that was desired. For, we actually find in the Rig-Veda the following *Mottos* vividly kept before the eye, for perpetual guidance:—

- I “ *United* be the thoughts of all, that all may happily *agree*.” (समानमस्तु वो मनो यथा वः सुसहासति ॥ R. V. X. 191. 4).
- II “ Go together (*in deeds and words*). Let the (various) thoughts (differently) expressed, have but *one end* in view. Let your minds be of *one accord*.” (संगच्छध्वं संवदध्वं सं वो मनांसि जानताम् ॥ R. V. X. 191. 2).

Moreover, there is yet stronger and corroborative evidence to show that, great weight was attached, even in Rig-Vedic times, to the *unanimous opinion* of a Public Body like the *Samiti* or the Village Community. Endeavours, therefore, appear to have been naturally made for

securing such an opinion, in view of getting over all possible difficulties likely to be caused by friction, and arriving at an amicable settlement. For, a rule seems to have been made, even during the Vedic times, that the *Samiti* (समिति) or the *Village Council of Elders*, which was the *Representative Village Commune*, should be of one mind, and that their thoughts should be united (समानो मंत्रः समितिः समानी समानं मनः, R. V. X. 191. 3), to which, by the bye, we shall refer in detail, later on.

In course of time, due representation of varied interests having become an accomplished fact, nay, probably complete, or at any rate such as was then desired and wanted by our Rig-Vedic ancestors, these Representative Bodies became popular, as they supplied their own wants, and had nearly a full complement of requisite establishments and occupations, crafts and trades, guilds and corporations; and these seem to have been in full swing during the period. This state of things, therefore, enabled our Vedic forefathers to continue their collective life and well directed energies, without any external assistance.

The *Samitis*, of which the *remnant* seems to be the present *Village Communities* or *Village-Councils*, which having now been more or less in a shattered or dislocated state, have, as such

lost their past vestiges and *former grandeur*, were *self-contained* and even *self-governing Bodies*, as they were altogether independent of any foreign relations, and had every thing in themselves that they were in need of. They have, therefore, been rightly supposed to be the *miniature-Republics*¹ and the *Sheet-anchor*¹ of Indian statecraft, as their Government was lodged with the representatives of the *Village Commune* (समिति), or the *Village Council of Elders*.

Thus, it is but a truism to say that, *Political Institutions in India*, or *Local Self-Government* and all that sort of thing, in the widest sense of the term, *is as old as the East*. Nay, it was once remarked even by Mr. Chisolm Anstey, a man of immense erudition, that "the East is the parent of Municipalities". "There is not a portion of the Country from West to East, from North to South, which is not swarming with Municipalities; and not only so, but like to our Municipalities of old, they are all bound together as in a species of net-work, so that you have ready

¹ Sir Henry Maine says, "It (the Village Community) is always viewed as a Representative body." p. 123. "I have several times spoken of them as organised and self-acting. They, in fact, include a nearly complete establishment of occupations and trades, for enabling them to continue their collective life, without assistance from any person or body external to them" p. 125, (*Vide Village Communities in the East and West.* pp. 123,125. Edition 1890).

made to your hand the frame-work of a great system of representation." While, Sir Charles Metcalfe says, "The Village Communities are little Republics, having nearly everything they can want within themselves, and almost independent of any foreign relations." "They seem to last where nothing else lasts. Dynasty after dynasty tumbles down; revolution succeeds to revolutions; Hindu, Pathan, Mogal, Mahratta, Sikh, English, are all masters in turn; but the Village Community remains the same." * * * * "This union of the Village Communities, each one forming a separate little state in itself, has, I conceive, contributed more than any other cause to the preservation of the people of India, through all the revolutions and changes which they have suffered, and is in a high degree conducive to their happiness, and to the enjoyment of a great portion of freedom and independence." (*Vide* Sir C. T. Metcalfe's Report, in the Select Committee of the House of Commons. 1832. Vol. III. Appendix 84. p 331).

Now, the *Sabhá* (सभा), or the so called Popular Assembly of the Representatives of the *Village Commune* or *Council of Elders*, of our good old halcyon days, was headed by a king, who was not only guided by the advice and opinion of the Council of Elders, or for the matter of that by the Representatives of the सभा or Popular

Assembly, but was actually *required to be elected by the people* (विशस्त्वा सर्वा वाञ्छन्तु R. V. X. 173.1). And more than this, or rather to crown the whole, the king so *elected* was, before the consecration ceremony (महाभिषेक) was performed, compelled to take an oath that he would forfeit every thing, if, unjustly, he ever committed any injury, &c, to any of his subjects. (Ait. Br. VIII. 15¹).

Obviously, the King was ever *for the Nation and for the People of his Empire* at large (ध्रुवो राजा विशामयम् ॥ R. V. X. 173.4). Because, he was *actually elected*, and was also *of the choice of his people*. As such, therefore, he had always to yield to *Public Opinion*, and to *the will of the Nation*. In the circumstances, although, apparently, the King had ample powers, he was not at all expected to wield them *arbitrarily*. Nor was he ever *allowed to do so*, especially as he was always *kept within constitutional limits*.

Thus, it seems, that the seeds of our *Constitutional Monarchy* were sown so far back as

1 Here, the King was required by the priest to take the following Oath. "Whatever pious works thou mightest have done, &c, &c, &c, all these together with thy position, thy good deeds, thy life, thy children, I would wrest from thee, shouldst thou do me any harm." (Martin Hough. Ph. D's. Translation of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. Vol II, p 520. Edition 1863).

the latter part of the Tertiary Period, when Egypt and Babylon, Chaldea and Assyria, Greece and Italy, were not yet born. Perhaps, the Reader here will suspect me and doubt the veracity of my statement. In order, therefore, to bring conviction home to him, and to assure him that I have only stated facts without exaggerating them in the least, I venture to put in a few extracts in support of my statement, from the writings of Vedic researchers, historians, antiquarians, and students of history, known to fame, and therefore make no apology for quoting therefrom.

Firstly, then, as regards our most ancient civilization, and that too of the Tertiary Period, Mr. Bal Gangadhar Tilak says, "Under these circumstances we need not be surprised if the European Aryas are found to be in an inferior state of civilisation, at the beginning of the Neolithic age. On the contrary, the wonder is that so much of the ante-diluvian religion or culture should have been preserved from the general wreck, caused by the last Glacial Epoch, by the religious zeal and industry of the bards or priests of the Iranian or the Indian Aryas. It is true, that they looked upon those relics of the ancient civilisation, as a sacred treasure, entrusted to them to be scrupulously guarded and transmitted to future generations. Yet,

considering the difficulties with which they had to contend, we cannot but wonder how so much of the anti-diluvian civilisation, religion, or worship was preserved in the Veda or the Avesta." (p. 435). And again he writes that, "Our theory now shows very clearly that though the Vedas are the oldest records of the Aryan race, yet the civilisation, or the characteristics and the worship of the deities mentioned therein did not originate with the Vedic bards, but was derived by them from their inter-glacial fore-fathers, and preserved in the forms of hymns for the benefit of posterity." p 463. "Unfortunately, we have very few materials for ascertaining the degree of this civilisation. But, we think we have shown that there are grounds to hold that the inter-glacial Aryan civilisation and culture must have been of a higher type than what is usually supposed to be." pp 463-464. (The Arctic Home in the Vedas. Edition 1903).

Secondly, in respect of the posteriority of Egyptian, Babylonian, and Grecian civilisation, Mr. Thornton observes, "Ere yet the Pyramids looked down upon the valley of the Nile—when Greece and Italy, those cradles of modern civilisation, housed only the tenants of the wilderness, India was the seat of wealth and grandeur." (Thornton's History of India. Vol I. p 2).

In the same way Mrs. Anne Besant, President of the Theosophical Society says, "India older than Greece or Rome—India that was old before Egypt was born. India that was ancient before Chaldea was dreamed of. India that went back thousands of centuries before Persia had come to the front.....She (India) was the earliest of the Aryan peoples, the first born of the mightiest races." (India and its Mission).

Besides, M. Louis Jacolliot, the author of "*La Bible Dans L'Inde*" declares that, "India is the world's Cradle; thence it is that the Common Mother in sending forth her children even to the utmost West, has, in unfading testimony of our origin, bequeathed us the legacy of her language, her laws, her *morale*, her literature, and religion."

"Traversing Persia, Arabia, Egypt, and even forcing their way to the cold and cloudy north, far from the sunny soil of their birth;of the civilisations founded by them, splendid Kingdoms may fall, and leave no ruins behind but some few ruins of sculptured columns; Manu inspired Egyptian, Hebrew, Greek, and Roman legislation, and his spirit still permeates the whole economy of our European laws." (The Author's preface. pp VII, VIII. Ed 1870).

Thus, from the testimony of these Oriental and Occidental scholars, who are also celebrated authors, the Reader will be fully convinced that our Vedic Civilisation is the most ancient, nay even Tertiary,¹ or say interglacial as admitted by Mr. Tilak. We shall, therefore, endeavour to ransack our Vedic and post-Vedic Literature, go deep into its invaluable mines, find out the precious seams that contain gold and jewels of first water, and place before the Reader such evidence from the Vedic and other texts, as will prove the origin of Public Assemblies, Representative Bodies, Miniature Republics, and Constitutional Monarchy in our Vedic and post-Vedic Polity, for showing that the aforesaid statements are neither myths nor fictions.

Now, before directly touching these points, I may, with advantage, here remind the Reader, at the very out-set, that as regards the origin of the aforesaid institutions and organisations of the Vedic Polity, there is nothing in the Vedic Literature, which can be pronounced as a separate work of the kind, or which can be called a chapter on the theme, or which at any rate professes to make any special or exhaustive treatment of the subject. But, it certainly abounds in ideas which give us a direct clue to the fact

1. *Vide my work the Aryavartie Home and its Arctic Colonies.*" pp. 19, 20, 379 @ 409, 487, 488.

that Institutions of the kind did certainly exist in Âryāvarta or Vedic Ind, during the Vedic period, nay even before, and subsequently. For, our Vedic ancestors had their fore-fathers of hoary antiquity¹ (पूर्वभिर्ऋषिभिः । R. V. I. 1.2.) and also of antediluvian times (इदं नम ऋषिभ्यः पूर्वजेभ्यः पूर्वैभ्यः पथिकृद्भ्यः । R. V. X. 14. 15.); and they had their *civilisation* and *wisdom* by inheritance. Moreover, they had derived the various sources of knowledge in respect of different institutions and organisations, from their fore-fathers, through innumerable generations, and their tenacity, in respect of ancient customs and usages, had made them retain and preserve their traditional precepts with scrupulous care and exactness. Because, these ancient precepts and old traditions had come down to them as from father to son, in uninterrupted succession ; and therefore, they were not only much esteemed by them, but were, moreover, rightly considered to be a part and parcel of the *invaluable legacy* bequeathed to them by their Tertiary fore-fathers, as they were the *root-source* of their greatness and strength of character, of the spirit of *self-reliance* and *self-dependence*, of freedom of action and knowledge of the various ancient institutions, whether religious or philosophical, social or political.

1. Vide "The Âryāvartian Home and Its Arctic Colonies." pp. 379 @408.

As a rule, the Vedic Polity seems to have been described in the form of precepts, which therefore were very short and concise. In fact, they were either neatly condensed and couched in aphorisms, or at best expressed in such singular brevity, as had made their sense rather abstruse in some cases. But, notwithstanding all this, their meaning, barring certain exceptions, appears to be invariably clear; and they undoubtedly form a mine of inexhaustible knowledge and wealth of rich information. Besides, these usually contain a world of wisdom in a variety of ways, which naturally augment their importance and enhance their real value. We shall, therefore, attempt to state them here, and quote the texts in support of our views, in order that their natural colours may be vividly seen, and their importance rightly appreciated.

It will be perceived, that the chief motto of the Indo-Aryans or the Aryans of Âryâvarta, —from where their colonies had spread abroad and their branches had become numerous¹—was “*Religion first, and Society or Politics afterwards.*” Evidently, this Religion consisted in the sacrifices offered to Gods, as these were con-

1 Vide—“*The Aryavartic Home and the Aryan Cradle in the Sapta-Sindhus, Or From Aryavarta to the Arctic and from the Cradle to the Colonies.*” pp 42, 48, 83, 84, 397. (The Author).

sidered to be the primeval germs of religious ordinances:—

यज्ञेन यज्ञमयजन्त देवा

स्तानि धर्माणि¹ प्रथमान्यासन् ।

(Rig-Veda. I. 164.50).

For, our Vedic ancestors thought that, it was the religion of sacrifices that contributed to the attainment of all desires of noble objects and lofty ideals. Besides, *Dharma* (Religion) has also been defined by the Vaisheshika School of Philosophy to be that, which contributes to our rise and prosperity, happiness and the fulfilment of all our good wishes

यतोऽभ्युदयनिश्चेयससिद्धिः स धर्मः ।

In the circumstances, these sacrifices were often performed for religious purposes, and in them there was always a large assemblage, where discussions were usually the order of the day, as knotty points and intricate questions in respect of all sorts of doubts were brought forward and placed for solution by *Savants*, who were ever entitled to speak with authority on the subject.

It appears that these religious or sacrificial Assemblies, called *विद्य*, were probably always

1 Griffith translates this verse as follows:—"By means of sacrifice, the Gods accomplished their sacrifice; these were the earliest ordinances" (of Religion).

full, and largely attended. For, in the Rig-Veda (IV. 2. 5), यज्ञ (Sacrifice) has been given the epithet of सभावान्, that is to say, such as is in the midst of a Sabhâ or Assembly, which is largely attended.

गोमाँ अग्ने.....यज्ञो नृवत्सखा...।

* * * असुर * * * सभावान् ॥ ५ ॥

(Rig-Veda. IV. 2-5.)

“Oh Asura Agni, let this sacrifice be rich in kine and patrons, and be in the midst of full Assembly.”

We have already remarked that, these Sacrificial Assemblies were taken advantage of, and resorted to, for religious discussions. But, along with these, literary and scientific questions, or quasi-religious, social, and political subjects were also, at times, introduced by Representative Elders in charge of those subjects. It was then, that the body was denominated either समिति or सभा, according to the nature of the work done therein. The Kings, also, had to attend such assemblies, and even take part in the discussions that ensued therein. For, in the Rig-Veda (X. 97:6), we find that the meeting of the King in the Council (समितौ) or Assembly, is likened to the collection of herbs together.

यत्रौषधीः समग्मत राजानः समितावि ।

(Rig-Veda X. 97.6)

But, this is not all. For, we find in another place, a very important declaration made to the effect, that a true king (राजासत्यः) always attended and adorned his Council (समितीरियानः) by his presence. That is to say, our Rig-Vedic ancestors supposed and rightly thought that, *such sovereign only was a true monarch as had ever at his heart the welfare of his subjects.* As such, therefore, he not only never failed to attend his Council or Assembly, but ever sought the advice of his Councillors, his trusted ministers, and the responsible representatives of his subjects. All this idea, obviously appears to have been conveyed by the following pithy words and condensed-expression, which, being pregnant with meaning, will certainly attract the attention it deserves.

राजा न सत्यः समितीरियानः ।

(R. V. IX. 92. 6.)

Moreover, in (R. V. X. 71. 10), we observe a very enviable phenomenon, not witnessed even by Greece or Rome, of offering congratulations to the successful Speaker and debater in *the Popular Assembly*, on his triumph and victory, his unusual dash and remarkable pluck, which *won the cause* of the Body, where all shades of thought were duly represented.

सर्वं नन्दन्ति यशसागतेन समासाहेन सख्या सखाः॥
 किल्बिषसृष्टितुषणिर्ह्येषामरं हितो भवति वाजिनाय॥१०॥
 (Rig-Veda. X. 71. 10).

Evidently, such a victor was naturally supposed to be the winner of the laurels, the evil-avorter, and the food-provider, always prepared and fit for vigorous action, as also ready for any deed of valour.

I subjoin herewith, for illucidation and easy reference, the translation of the verse as rendered into English by Mr. Griffith:—

“ All friends are joyful in the friend who cometh in triumph, having conquered in assembly. He is their blame-avorter, food provider, prepared is he and fit for deed of vigour.”

Besides, there are other ennobling texts nay even dignifying passages, containing ideal thoughts of a very high order, in the Rig-Veda, which therefore we shall presently refer to, in detail. From these, it will be seen, that during the Vedic times, the king was not only required to be *elected* by, and with the consent of, the people (विशस्त्वा सर्वा वाञ्छन्तु...R. V. X. 173. 1), but that, when once he was consecrated with the requisite religious ceremonies (महाभिषेकेण), and enthroned as the king of a *Constitutional Monarchy*, scrupulous care was always taken by the nation that *chose* him

for the regal office, to warn him, that he never did any thing that was unbecoming to his postion *as a Ruler*, nor anything that would eventually lead to his downfall, dethronement, or deprivation of the powers and authority, which it was intended that he should ever exercise with discretion (मा त्वद्राष्ट्रमाभिभ्रशत् ॥ R. V. X. 173. 1). On the other hand, as if to keep the balance of power, or to counteract any evil effects, the nation also appears to have been duly warned, that *union was strength* ; that therefore, *all should be of one mind* ; and that *unanimous voice should always prevail in their actions*.

संगच्छध्वं संवदध्वं सं वो मनांसि जानताम् ।

(R. V. X. 191. 2).

Nay, in the interests of the king, as also of the entire nation and the Empire at large, he was asked to be firm (ध्रुवस्तिष्ठ R. V. X. 173. 1), as firm as the mountain (पर्वत इवाविचाचलिः R. V. X. 173. 2), and thus maintain an empire (इह राष्ट्रमुधारय R. V. X, 173. 2). But, apart from this, even the Gods, viz. Indra and Agni, were duly supplicated to grant, that his Empire might last for ever. (ध्रुवं त इन्द्र. आऽग्निश्च राष्ट्रं धारयतां ध्रुवम्॥ R. V. X. 173. 5).

There are brighter vistas still, and these are very edifying indeed. For, they contribute, in no small measure, to bring to the surface and

even to the view of all, what was never seen or heard, nor dreamed of before, by any nation. And here, we come across some facts, face to face ; facts which are found in the literary archives of *Bhārata Varsha* (India) ; nay, in the very document, which belongs to India and to India only ; viz., in that *Book of books*,¹ which has been considered to be the *most ancient document* in the whole world, not to say even *the most reliable*, beyond all manner of doubt.

And it is here, that we find some latent forces working in the right direction ; and these, having gradually extended our ancient ancestors' vision, had also widened the horizon of their view, which therefore had naturally generated in them a deep love of the freedom of thought and action. This, in turn, had created a craving for exchange of ideas, and these having given rise to innumerable discussions on a variety of subjects, great enthusiasm used to prevail, and much interest seems to have been awakened in the very nature of things. Evidently, as observed before, (*supra pp 46, 47*), the Sacrificial Assembly was naturally the usual place where there was free ventilation of thought, and of individual opinions. But, in this, only

1 Xenaide A. Ragozin calls the Rig-Veda "the Book of Books" (*p 133*), and says further that, "This is, without the shadow of a doubt, *the oldest book of the Aryan family of nations*." (*p 114*). *Vide Vedic India*. Edition 1895.

matters connected with religion and sacrifices, rites and ceremonials, were at first discussed. As, however, necessity arose, social matters had also to be introduced therein, since that was the *rendezvous* where all men used to gather together, for solution of doubts and redress of grievances. Gradually, social matters grew in importance, and even assumed political character. It was, therefore, thought desirable to separate the three Institutions, viz., the Sacrificial Assembly (त्रिदश) from the Social Conference or the *Village Commune* of Elders (समिति), as also the latter from the *Popular Assembly* (सभा) or the Great Congress of the Nation.

Thus, *Sabhá* (सभा) and *Samiti* (समिति), to which reference has already been made in passing, were formed for discussing questions either concerning *National weal* or affecting *Village* interests; and herein, apparently, lay the *Origin* of the *Popular Assembly of Representatives* and of the *Village Commune, or Council of Elders*. Probably, in course of time, various shades of thoughts and different *Communal* as well as *national interests* were required to be represented, as a matter of course. In view, therefore, of giving a fair share of justice to all, by listening and paying due attention to the wants of the nation and of the country at large, nay to the wants of every family, clan, and community, the *Popular*

Assembly or (सभा) came to be recognised as a Representative Body of the Nation and the country; while the Elders of the Village represented the *Village Commune* or *Council*, popularly known as the *Village Community* or (समिति).

Now, a question would naturally arise, what were the legitimate functions of this *Popular Assembly*? Who presided therein? Was it a King? If so, was he despotic and absolute in power, or was he *elected*, and his will *governed by the Council of Elders*? As the query is very important, we shall endeavour to place before the Reader a picture of the polity of the Vedic Epoch, and of the subsequent period, in its natural colours, after adducing the requisite evidence along with the Vedic Texts, for corroboration of facts, and in support of the statements herein made. It seems that the functions of the *Popular Assembly* or the Representative Body were aimed at securing the good of the people whom the Elders in the Council represented; and this appears clear from some of the rules of the Samiti (समिति) framed for its guidance and also that of the nation, of which the following are prominent, and certainly worth paying due attention to:—

(a) To assemble together (in the *Village Commune* of the Elders and in the *Popu-*

lar Assembly or the Body of the Representatives of the Council of the Village Elders): संगच्छ-ध्वम्.....R. V. X. 191. 2.

(b) To be of *one voice*. (That is to say, to be *unanimous in the expression of their-views): संवदध्वम्.....R. V. X. 191. 2.*

(c) To be of *one mind*, and all to be of *one accord*—संवो मनांसि जानताम्.....; especially, as even the Gods became united, and sat down to their appointed share—देवा भागं यथा पूर्वे संजानाना उपासते ॥ R. V. X. 191. 2.

(d) To bear in mind that this advice was common to all, (as it was meant for the good and happiness of all): समानो मंत्रः.....R. V. X. 191. 3.

(e) To remember that the *Samiti* (समिति)—the *Council of Village Elders* or the *Representative Village Commune* was common to all: समितिः समानी R. V. X. 191.3). Evidently meaning thereby that the *Village Cummune i. e. the Village Council* of Elders or the *Village Community*, was open to every one. Nay, it was free to all classes and professions, and was in no way intended to be *sectarian in purpose*, or *biased in character*.

(f) To see that every one in the *Village Commune* and even in the *Popular*

Assembly was of one opinion: समानं मनः.....R. V. X. 191. 3.

(g) To discern that the *intent and purpose* of the whole *Village Commune* and of the *Popular Assembly* was *one and the same*: सह चित्तमेषान् । R. V. X. 191. 3.

(h) To be *ever of one and the same resolve*, that is, of firm determination: समानीच अकूतिः.....R. V. X. 191. 4.

(i) To be *of one heart*: समाना हृदयानि चः । R. V. X. 191. 4. This was in view of securing happy agreement, as *Union¹ was strength*. Nay, it was but a most important factor in the achievement of success, at all times, and in all actions.

(j) To *elect a king of the choice of the people*: विशस्त्वा सर्वा वाञ्छन्तु.....R. V. X. 173. 1.

(k) To have *respect for the authority* and the king, and to see that he was never dethroned: मात्वं रामघ्निभ्रशत् । R. V. X. 173. 1 ; (nor his authority set aside).

(l) To take, however, requisite care at the same time, that their *ever dear nation* was

1 The Reader will also see the same thing reiterated in the followings:—

संहतिः भवसी पुंसां ॥ Hit. संहतिः कार्यसाधिका ॥ समवायो विदुस्ततः ।

duly respected, and that no wicked person ever governed or lorded it over them: मा नो दुःशंस ईशत । R. V. I. 23. 9.

These abstract notions about the *usefulness* of an Assembly, *the force of public opinion created by the Assembly*, the belief that *union was strength*, the very high ideal that the nation should be guided by a king whose authority was *constitutionally limited and who was even elected by them*, the sentiment that *due respect was ever paid to authority*, the conception that the *administration must always be just, wise, and sympathetic*, and the *essential thing that no wicked person should ever have any authority over them*, seem to have been *in full swing*, not only during the period of the Rig-Veda, but also *in the times of Yajur-Veda and Atharva-Veda*, as we shall notice later on.

In the Vedic times, each village or a group of villages had, as observed before, its *Sa-miti* (समिति), of which the vestiges are even now found in the *Village Community*, the *Village Commune*, or the *Village Council*; and this *Sa-miti* had its representatives in the *Popular Assembly* or सभा, which was evidently intended for the entire territories of the wide Empire under its charge. In some of these, it seems, the king took part, and even presided over them sometimes, as in one verse of the Rig-Veda, a

hint appears to have been inadvertently thrown to the effect, that "He is really a good king who attends the Village Communes or *Assemblies*" राजा... ..सत्यः समितीरियानः R. V. IX. 92.6. There seems no doubt, that the dominions under the administration of the king of the Vedic Period were very extensive; and yet wider Empire was not only desired (तेनास्मान्ब्रह्मणस्पते मिराष्ट्राय¹ वर्तय ॥ R. V. X. 174. 1), but was even sought and actually obtained by our ancient ancestors (अभित्वा देव सविताभिसोमो अवीवृतत् । अभि त्वा विश्वा भूतान्यभिवर्तो यथाससि ॥ R. V. X. 174. 3),² by dint of strength and indomitable energy, by force of character and towering genius.

It may here be noted with advantage, that the empire thus won was maintained with great vigilance and foresight, as evidently appears from the results achieved. For, in the first place, particular care was taken to quell every disturbance and subdue all insurrections, by destroying foes and vanquishing rivals : (अभिवृत्य सपत्नानभि या नो अरातयः । अभि पृतन्यन्तं तिष्ठाभियो न इरस्यति ॥ R. V. X. 174.2). Manifestly, owing to requisite precautionary, and at times strong

1 " With this, O Brahmanaspati, let us attain to wider royal sway." (Griffith).

2 " Soma, and Savitar the God, have made thee a victorious king. All elements have aided thee, to make thee general conqueror." (Griffith).

measures, profound peace was secured, and it had reigned supreme throughout the length and breadth of our great Vedic Empire. There were, no doubt, hostilities, on account of religious schisms. But, these were beyond our confines and the border of Bhârata-Varsha or Ind. Thus, internal tranquillity had all along prevailed, and was enjoyed by our Vedic Nation from end to end. This, in the very nature of things, was but the means to an end ; and the legitimate fruits thereof were at once visible, ante pp 65-68. Since, there was the rapid spread of knowledge, growth of science and art, of trade and guilds, as also of all sorts of coveted professions and occupations (नानानं वा उनो धियो तिवृतानि जनानां । R. V. IX. 112.1), of poetry and philosophy, of medicine and surgery, nay of hypnotism and *mesmerism*¹

1 In the Rig-Veda (X. 60. 12 ; X. 137.7), we find reference made to *touches* or *laying on of hands* to *relieve suffering* or *restore health*. I therefore give, hereinbelow, the Rik-stanzas for ready reference, along with their translation in English :—

अयमेहस्तो भगवानयमे भगवत्तरः ॥ अयमे विश्वमेवजोऽयं शिवाभिर्मर्जन् ॥
(R. V. X. 60. 12).

हस्ताभ्यां दशज्ञास्वाम्यां जिह्वावाचः पुरोगवी ।

अनामयिस्तुभ्यां त्वाताभ्यां त्वोपस्पृशामसि ॥ (R. V. X. 137.7).

12 “ Felicitous is this mine hand, yet more felicitous is this.”

“ This hand contains all healing balms, and this makes whole with gentle touch ;” (i. e. with light friction, laying on of hands, or hypnotizing passes).

7. “ The tongue that leads the voice precedes. Then with our ten fold branching hands.”

“ With these two chasers of disease we stroke thee with a gentle touch.”

After giving the translation, Mr. Griffith observes thus:—“ The stanza is important as showing that the Indians employed touches or laying on of hands to relieve suffering, or to restore health. (vide Hymns of the Rig-Veda. Translated. Vol. II. p. 583. Edition 1897).

or will-power, which gave relief to sufferers and restored health. This, obviously, is a doctrine to the effect that one person can exercise influence over the will and nervous system of another, by virtue of a supposed emanation proceeding from him, or simply by the domination of his will over that of the person operated on.

Evidently, our Rig-Vedic Ancestors had made themselves masters of this *Will-power*, or rather had complete knowledge of this *animal-magnetism*, thousands of years before Egypt was born, or even before Babylon and Chaldea, Assyria and Persia, for Greece and Rome, had come to the front. And it was not known in civilized Europe until the latter part of the 18th century, when it was but a German physician named Mesmer that propounded the theory in 1778 A. D.

Thus, it will be perceived that our Vedic Ancestors were much in advance of the times, as they were pushing forward in all directions, with amazing industry and learning, not only in the science and art of government, but also in other matters connected with good Government.

For, we find great respect and homage paid to every profession and occupation, to all merchants and guilds, to carpenters and artisans, to potters and blacksmiths, for all the prosperity and wealth brought to the country by

them, owing to the tremendous sea-borne and internal trade in merchandise, which they themselves had produced.

'नमो मंत्रिणे वाणिजाय.....' (White Yajus. XVI. 19).

नमस्तक्षभ्यो रथकारेभ्यश्च वो नमो नमः कुलालेभ्यः कमरिभ्यश्च वोनमो नमः । (The White Yajus. XVI. 27).

All this by the way goes to prove that there reigned profound peace in the country, and that further, there was no internal disturbance whatever, during the Vedic period for a considerable time. Nor, for the matter of that, had any civil wars made insecure the throne of the reigning king, upon whom much depended security of life and property, the peace of the entire nation, and the tranquillity in the Empire. For, one hymn of the Rig-Veda declares in express terms that, "*Parmanent and Stead-fast* is the king of the nation "(ध्रुवो राजा विशामयम् ॥ R. V. X. 173.4). Because, the position of the *Paramount king* having become altogether secure, owing to immense tranquillity in his wide dominions, his subjects, as also

1. Mr. Griffith translates the verses as follows :—

19....." Homage to the prudent merchant."

27 " Homage to you carpenters, and to you chariot-makers, homage. Homage to you potters, and to you blacksmiths, homage."

the *vassal-kings* and the *tributary* princes, had to pay to the Suzerain Power their quota of taxes and the tribute, which seem to have been paid *without demur* ; and this appears clear from the Rig-Vedic text itself. Since, it says, "And then, may Indra make the clans bring tribute unto thee, (that is to the king), alone."

अथो त इन्द्रः केवलीर्विशो बलिहृतस्करत् ॥ ६ ॥
(Rig-Veda X. 173.6).

Now, although the king was paramount, he was in no way despotic. For, he was always guided by his *Council of Elders*, or the *Representatives of the Popular Assembly* (सभा). In fact, he was an *elected king*, and such an elected king always meant, that he was of the *Peoples' choice* : (विशस्त्वासर्वावाञ्छन्तुं ॥ R. V. X. 171.1). Therefore, any the slightest act of his, that tended to do any thing *not desired by his nation*, was likely to bring him to grief. Especially, for the reason, that he was bound to take an oath that he would never do anything that would injure his subjects, and that if he did this, he would forfeit his crown, nay, even the merit of all his good actions, and every thing else. (*Vide ante p 99*). Owing to this *Constitutional Control*, timely kept and properly administered, the king always felt for his subjects, ever evinced very *sympathetic attitude in respect of his nation*, scrupulously

guarded their interests, both as King and President of the *Popular Assembly* (सभा), and *protected them from external dangers and internal troubles, with parental affection*. He was, in the circumstances, naturally *loved* by his nation, and therefore, the people desired that such their king should never be dethroned (मा त्वं राष्ट्रमधिभ्रशत् । R. V. X. 173.1).

But, apart from this, there was also the trusted *Council of Elders*, and this withal was invested with great powers, as Representatives of the *Popular Assembly* (सभा), or of the *Village Commune* (समिति). These, properly understood their own responsibilities, never usurped the authority of others, nor abused their own. The Popular Institutions, therefore, viz the Representative *Popular Assembly*, and the Miniature Republic of the *Village Community*, always commanded very great respect and extreme sympathy, throughout the Empire. We, accordingly, in the very nature of things, find such expressions in the Vedic text, as follows:—"Homage to the Assemblies, and to you Lords (or Presidents) of the Assemblies."

नमः सभाभ्यः सभापतिभ्यश्च वो नमो नमः ।

(The White Yajurveda. XVI. 24).

We have already observed, that *he only* was considered to be a really good king, who

attended Samitis (समितीः) or the Councils of Elders, evidently, for watching the administration of the several Units of the Empire, (राजा न सत्यः समितीरियानः । R. V. IX. 92.6). And this testimony, found in the oldest document in the world—the Rig Veda—in respect of the king attending the Councils of the *Popular Assemblies* or the *Village Communes*, with a view to consult his responsible ministers and the representatives of his subjects, for purposes of discussing questions affecting the welfare of his nation and the government of his territories, pretty well clears the ground, and by at once raising the curtain, makes us pause and think, that even according to the present-day light of the so called modern civilization, the Rig-Vedic Polity does not appear a whit inferior to that of the West of the Mediæval Ages. Nay, it, by all means, seems to be immeasurably in advance of the times ; although, as usual, many Westerners have, owing to ignorance and prejudice, always been in the habit of imagining themselves to be superior to all, as Ockley has remarked (ante pp 33,34), or their civilization as being the best in the world, and thus entertaining a false or mistaken belief that Oriental Sovereigns are despots ; that they are deaf to the voice of the people ; that *Representative Government* is foreign to their notions ; and that it is only the West that shares the

wisdom of the world. But, as observed before, there would be found in the Vedas and the Vedic Polity many a thing higher and nobler than that which Greece and Rome possessed in their brightest days, or which their loftiest intellects could then devise, nay, far more advanced even in that which the civilization of Europe claimed during the Mediæval Ages, or later on in the sixteenth century.

For, the more we scrutinise and go deep into Vedic mines, the more do we come across extremely precious seams, which not only dazzle our eyes and take us by surprise, but land us into regions which appear to be perfectly known to our ancestors before. And these being marvellously rich and precious, in respect of things that appertain to the most ancient polity, we naturally get therein what the Westerner's never dreamed of in the least before.

In the Vedic polity, therefore, if we study it from the right point of view, and learn the lessons from *genuine and original sources*, nay, *pure and uncontaminated springs*, we shall certainly find here *more of Constitutional Government and of limited Monarchy*, and *much less of despotic rule or imperial sway and high handed administration*,

As in the Rig-Vedic times, so also during the Yajurvedic and the Atharva Vedic¹ period, love of culture, love of *self-dependance*, *self-reliance*, and freedom of action, seem to have pervaded the masses. There was, therefore, much regard for the popular Institutions—the *समिति* which was the *Representative Village Commune*, as also the *सभा* or the Popular Assembly; and as such, a great deal of enthusiasm was naturally evinced in the execution of public functions and the performance of duties, which involved either village responsibilities or public welfare, communal interests or administrative reforms. For instance, we find not only great tribute of respect paid to the *Popular Assembly*, that is, the *Representative सभा*, as will be observed from the Vedic text—“*Homage to Assemblies*,”—but due reverence appears also to have been offered to the Head or the President of the Assembly (*vide supra p 122*).

Nay, more than this, the regard of our ancient ancestors for this Public Body seems to

1. As to its antiquity, Griffith says as under:—

“I have called the Atharva-Veda a comparatively late addition to the three ancient Vedas, of which, it may be observed, the one only, the Rig-Veda, is original and historical, the other two being merely liturgical compilations.” (Translation of the Atharva-Veda. Preface. p. IV) Further on, he says, “But, the Atharva Samhitā likewise contains pieces of great antiquity, which may perhaps have belonged more to the people proper,.....” Do. p. VI

have been so *deep*, and they were so *sensitive* in respect of their short-comings, that they had actually offered their prayers to Gods, to forgive them whatever *sins of commissions and omissions* they might have committed. I, therefore, venture to quote the original from the Vedic text, and give its translation below, for easy reference.

...यत्सभार्या...एनश्चक्रुमा वयं तस्यावयजनमसि।

(White Yajurveda. XX. 17).

" Each fault (or short-coming) in the Assembly,.....that we have doneeven of that sin, thou (O Sûrya) art the expiation."

In the Atharva-Veda, moreover, when our *Vedic Empire* was firmly established and had become secure, many interesting details are found ; and as these are of great moment, I shall here mention only a few of them, as they have an important bearing on the general Vedic Polity and the administration of the vast Empire of the period.

And first and foremost is the reference made to the *Popular Assembly*, and the importance attached to it, especially in regard to its character and purpose. In point of this, therefore, the *Assembly* organised by our fore-fathers had a *grandeur and originality all its own*,

neither equalled by Greece, nor by Rome, nor for the matter of that by any other nation of Europe, Africa, and America, till very recently. For, our *locally Organised Representative Council* (समिति) or the *Village Commune of Representative Elders*, as also our *Great Popular Assembly* (सभा) of the *Representatives of the Council of Elders*, were supposed to be but a *great power in the Land of the Seven Rivers* (सप्तसिन्धवः), whose protection, help, and support were ardently wished and scrupulously sought. For, these two public bodies were considered to be of *Divine Origin*, as they were supposed to be Prajâpati's two *daughters*. Hereinbelow, therefore, I give the full text from the Atharva-Veda, with its translation into English for facility of reference.

सभा च मा समितिश्चावतां

प्रजापतेर्द्विहितरौ संविद्वाने ।.....

(Atharva-Veda VII. 12 1).

"In concord, may Prajâpati's two daughters, the Assembly and the Village Commune or Council, both protect me."

And what was the nature of this *Sabhâ* (सभा) or the *Popular Assembly* of the Vedic Polity? It was decidedly a splendid organisation brought into being by our fore-sighted ancestors, who had the most commanding genius

and towering intellect, for the express purpose of discussing knotty points and solving intricate questions, whether *religious, social, or political*. These discussions, as pointed out before, (vide p. 47), were only religious at first. But, with the advance of knowledge, rapid march in our intellectual progress, and great strides in our state of civilization, social and political topics were gradually introduced therein. Because, the various needs of the Community used to engage the attention of the *Representatives*, while administrative reforms had already claimed the sympathy of all. We, accordingly, find the Atharva Veda giving, *in right earnest*, the definition of *Assembly* (समा), and stating to say, that the *Assembly* means, or is intended only for, *Discussion* which was then supposed to be *inviolable* (नरिष्ठा). I, therefore, quote hereinbelow the Vedic text, and give its translation, as rendered into English by Muir:—

विद्म ते समे नाम

नरिष्ठा नाम वा अस्मि ।

(Atharva-Veda. VII. 12.2).

“Assembly, we know thy name ; thy name is conversation.”

Now, the word नरिष्ठा in the above text is certainly very important. It would, therefore, not be out of place to give here its ex-

planation as offered by Sāyana, the great Vedic Exegetist. For, says he, "बहवः संभूय यथेकं वाक्यं वदेयुः । तद्धि न परैरतिलंघ्यम् मतो ऽनतिलंघ्यत्वाच्चरिष्येति नाम सभाया युज्यते ।"

The import of this obviously seems to be that, where the Assembly of the people arrived at *one decision* (एकं वाक्यं वदेयुः ।), this was supposed to be *inviolable* (अनतिलंघ्यत्वात् । नपरैरतिलंघ्यम् ।). The Assembly, therefore, was called नरिषा.

Here, then, there has actually been presented to our view a world of meaning in a couple of lines ; and these, as also various other texts already quoted before (pp 48, 108, 114, 115, 120, 122, 126, 127, 128), from the Rik, Yajus, and Atharva Vedas, certainly offer an *exact*, not to say very *beautiful picture of, and distinct idea about*, (I) the Popular Assembly (सभा), (II) the Village Community (समिति), as also of (III) the Sacrificial Assembly (विदथ), which gave birth to the first two. Evidently, the sources of information that we have thus ventured to place before the Reader, are, beyond all manner of doubt, not only *the most ancient and original*, but, have, in no way, been polluted, or contaminated by any the least foreign influence, as admitted even by Western scholars of note. For, Dr. Rudolf Roth has, in the volume of the German Oriental Society for 1848, p. 216,

declared to say, that "the Veda and the Avesta flow from one fountain, like two streams, the one of which, the Vedic has continued fuller, purer, and truer to its original character ; while the other has become in many ways polluted, has changed its original course, and consequently cannot always be followed back with equal certainty, to its sources."

Notwithstanding, however, all these solid facts and the irrefragable evidence hereinbefore cited, the wild; not to say ignorant talk, as usual, makes its appearance every now and then, in the West, in some quarters, asserting that, (1) "*No Oriental nation had ever shown any trace of capacity for self-Government,*" and that (2) it was only the West that gave to the East the most coveted institutions like the Public Assembly and the Representative Body, although the fact is on record that both Greece and Rome, and even Egypt, which have been supposed to have inspired other western nations, after their decline and fall, were but crawling on all their fours, or perhaps, were yet unborn at the time, when our Vedic Ind was enjoying *Self-Government* under the *ever parental care of our older ancestors* ; when, she (the Vedic Ind) was the Mistress of such a magnificent and extensive Empire, as was the dread and envy of all,

(*vide* The Aryavartīc Home and its Arctic Colonies, chapter XIV); when her Political Institutions were in working order; and when, moreover, she was in a state of giving lessons to all the world, in matters relating to Religion and morals, Philosophy and knowledge of *Self*, nay, Science and Art, Language and literature, Government and administration, as stated before.

Now, we have already noticed the antiquity of the Atharva Veda and the hoary past of the Rig-Veda (*Vide ante p 125*, as also Introduction, Foot-note 1), and yet, how phenomenal and elevating was the attempt *even then made*, to show due courtesy to, and respect for, the feelings and sentiments of all, in the deliberations of the Assembly? The fact, therefore, may be recorded with just pride and pleasure, as it certainly redounds to the immense credit and glory of our Vedic Ancestors. For, notwithstanding the incalculable distance of time, that separates the Hellenic or the modern civilization of Europe from that of the Vedic Epoch, scrupulous attention appears to have been usually bestowed even in Vedic times to see, that the discussions in the Assembly were *neither coarse nor irrelevant, neither sarcastic nor unfair, neither unjust nor impolitic*, but always sober, invariably *to the point*, and by all means,

affecting the interests of the people within the Empire. (ante pp 122, 126 @ 128, 132).

Besides, the functions of the Assembly were always viewed as being peculiarly *sacred* and entitled to reverence (ante p 126). Our hoary, not to say apotheosized fore-fathers (पितरः) were, therefore, actually prayed for assistance, and their guide was earnestly solicited to see that the words, which fell from their lips in the Samiti (समिति) that is the *Commune* or *Council* of the *Village* Representatives assembled (वदानी.....संगतेषु), should not only be *free* from *impropriety* and *rudeness*, but always *agreeable* (चारु), as also *fair*, and *never foul*.

.....चारु वदानी पितरः संगतेषु ।

(Atharva Veda. VII. 12.1).

“ Fair be my words, O Fathers, at the meetings.”

Moreover, coupled with this requisite *courtesy* and *politeness in speech*, there was also the knowledge of the key to success, which our Vedic fore-fathers pre-eminently possessed ; and above all, they never lacked the *force of reasoning*, nor were they in any way behind, in the *tactics of argumentation*. For, the debater seems to have had *the knack* and *the pluck*, *the adroitness* and the *mastery*, in winning the Assembly over to his side ; and Indra appears to have been

supplanted for giving the debater *the palm* and the *pre-eminence in the Assembly*.

एषामहं समासीनानां वर्चो विज्ञानमाददे ।

अस्याः सर्वस्याः संसदो मामिन्द्र भगिनं कृणु ॥ ३ ॥

(Atharva Veda. VII. 12.3).

“ Of these men seated here, I make the splendour and the lore mine own. Indra, make me conspicuous in all this gathered company ” (i. e. in the Assembly).

Besides, the debater seems practically to have had *such commanding eloquence* and charming speech, *such force of character* and *self-confidence*, that even when the mind of the audience was absent, or turned away from the discussion in the Assembly, (यद्वो मनः परागतं यद्वद्भूमिह वेह वा । Atharva Veda. VII. 12.4), he was *sure to draw their attention to himself* (तद्व आ वर्तयामसि मयि वो रमतां मनः । A. V. VII. 12.4), by means of his own powerful speech, attractive eloquence, and very persuasive line of argument.

The above text, of which I herewith append translation for facility of reference, forms, therefore, an important factor in the conduct of the discussions and deliberations of the Assembly, and contains declarations of great moment, as the points raised therein appear to be pre-

eminently suggestive and remarkably forcible:—

“Whether your thoughts are turned away, or bound and fastened here or there.

“We draw them hitherward again: Let your mind firmly rest on me.”

There is also another very elegant hymn, which has a charm all its own, although the original idea conveyed therein appears to have been evidently borrowed from the Rig-Veda (X. 191.2). For, the hymn (Atharva Veda VI. 74) has not only expressed strong desire for harmony in thought and action, but seems, moreover, to have given point-blank directions and deliberate advice, beyond all expectation, to our much honoured Aryan nation of the Vedic times, to be *united in body and mind* (सं वः पूच्यन्तां तन्वः संमनांसि समुव्रता। A. V. VI. 74.1), as *unity is the very embodiment of strength*. The hymn then further asks to bear in mind the never to be forgotten motto, “Let there be union of your minds, let there be union of your hearts”—(संज्ञपनं वो मनसोऽथो संज्ञपनं हृदः। A. V. VI. 74.2). And last but not least, the Lord of Three Titles also appears to have been requested to “cause the peoples here, to be one minded”—इमां जनान्संमनसस्कृधीह॥ (A. V. VI. 74.3)

Thus, we have endeavoured to give a Bird's eye-view of the important functions of the great Public Institutions of the Vedic Period. We have also traced them to their sources, and found that they had their *origin* in the *Vidatha* (विदथ) or the Vedic Sacrificial Assembly, which in turn had given rise to *Samiti* (समिति) or the Village Community, and the latter in time to the full fledged *Sabhâ* (सभा) or the Popular Assembly of the Vedic Nation (*supra pp 46 @ 50, 106, 107*). We further showed how these had gradually grown in importance (*p 51*) ; how steps having been timely taken they had due *representation* of all shades of thought and of variety of interests involved (*pp 23, 48, 92, 93, 97*) ; how owing to love of *self-dependence* and *self-reliance*, they had, with commendable prudence and forethought, very skilfully managed to supply their own wants, by establishing manifold social groups, from the labouring and the cultivating to the manufacturing, trading, artisan, and the professional class ; how they had made the whole machinery completely organised and *self-acting*, enabling them thereby to continue their collective life without any external assistance (*pp 22, 61 @ 71*) ; how this state of things had made them self-governing Bodies (*pp 96, 98*) ; how they had an *elected* king, and how seeds of *Constitutional Monarchy* were sown even in that early

Epoch (pp 51, 99, 121); how our Vedic nation and the king had mutual confidence (pp 108, 122); how *union* was supposed to be the *real source of strength* (pp 115, 116); how, for the attainment of this object and for sundry other reasons, every effort was made, and debates skilfully conducted, to show off with advantage the Nation's weal ; how *courteous* was the language ever used therein ; and how attractively eloquent were the speeches made in the Assembly, for producing the desired effect. (ante pp 132, 133, 134).

Chapter IV. The Pre-Buddhistic Period

AND

The King for the People.

ध्रुवो राजा विशामयम् ॥ (ऋ० वे० १०-१७३-४).

We have so far produced sufficient evidence from the invaluable documents of our Vedic Literature ;—the priceless legacy bequeathed to us by our hoary ancestors. And this, I think, will throw quite a flood of light on the ignorance of those who have not been inclined to make requisite researches in this very interesting subject of our Vedic *Self-Government*, or even to go beneath the surface, and bestow such careful attention as it really deserves.

The dictum, therefore, that “ *No Oriental Nation had ever shown a trace of Capacity for Self-Government,*” announced to the world with a bit of slur, by many a learned man of the West, and even by statesmen of the foremost rank, will, it is hoped, find its own fallacy, nay, be exploded in time, and thus suffer its own deserved fate. For, *Truth*, after all, will shine in the end, and when its all enveloping rays will illumine the world, darkness will vanish as a matter of course.

But, to proceed. We have already shown that during the Vedic and even Pre-Vedic times,

ours was a Self-Government and a Constitutional Monarchy (*vide supra pp 99, 109, infra pp 139, 145-6*), guided by the *Council of Elders*, whose ideal was the ennobling spirit of *self-dependence*, whose *motto* was "The King for the People," "Not the People for the king," and which, therefore, had always enjoyed the confidence of the Nation. Moreover, adequate *Representation*, due regard for popular feeling, and great respect for the sentiments of the Nation, having been the guiding principle and the very foundation of the solid fabric of our *Self-Government*, law and order had naturally prevailed, and profound peace was reigning supreme, throughout the length and breadth of our Vedic Ind, that resounded with spontaneous shouts and carols of *Vive le Roy*.

In the circumstances, anarchy was ever condemned in unmeasured terms (*vide Rāmāyana II. 67. 9 @ 31 ; Mahā Bhārata XII. 66. 3 ; XII. 67. 13, 22' ; and even the King-less condition, or the state of "No King and all Equals," never found favour in the hearts of our people (M. Bh. XII. 58. 14, 15, 21). For, we had always cherished the idea that, "the King had something of divine nature¹ in him".—(ना ऽ विष्णुः पृथिवीपतिः ।). The*

1 न हि जात्ववमन्तव्यो मनुष्य इति भूमिपः ।

महती देवता ह्येषा नररूपेण तिष्ठति ॥

(श्रीमन्महाभारते १२-६७-४०).

South-Indian Texts Edition.

diametrically opposite view, therefore, of "No King and all Equals," was not only supposed to be *unnatural*, disastrous,¹ and *monstrous*, but was at once pooh-poohed and hooted out with the contempt it deserved, by all our ancestors well versed in polity.

Having had, therefore, due regard to all these matter-of-fact considerations, and in view of nipping in the very bud the most condemn-able, not to say harmful and extremely selfish idea that "*the People are for the King*", the practice had formerly obtained, as we have already shown, of *the election of the King by the People*, in the hoary Rig Vedic period (विशस्त्वा सर्वा वाञ्छतु। ऋ० वे० १०. १७३. १ ; ध्रुवो राजा विशामयम्। ऋ० वे० १०. १७३. ४; त्वा ई विशो न राजानं वृणाना.....ऋ० वे० १०. १२४. ८), not to say, even later on, in the times of Atharva Veda (त्वां विशो वृणतां राज्याय.....अ० वे० ३. ४. २.). And our foresighted ancestors very wisely kept up these pre-Vedic traditions of the *election of the king by the people*, as they were fully alive to the fact that these had served to keep under control the king's caprices and his way-ward conduct, and withal made him spend his life in 'ever

1 एवमेव विना राज्ञा विनश्येयुरिमाः प्रजाः ।
अन्धे तमासि मज्जेयुरगोपाः पशवो यथा ॥ ११ ॥
स्त्रियश्चापुरुषा मार्गं सर्वालंकारभूषिताः ।
निर्भयाः प्रतिपद्यन्ते यदि रक्षति भूमिपः ॥ ३२ ॥

(म० भा० १२. ६७).

endeavouring for the good of his people and his subjects.

Now, this Institution of *Electing the king* was naturally liked by our people, as it was considered to be very *popular* and *sacred*. *Popular* because it involved the very important interests of the peoples themselves; and *sacred* because, it implied a divine trust entitled to reverence. It was, evidently owing to this reason, that it continued and lasted for a considerably long time. For, as we have already noticed, it first originated in the pre-Rig-Vedic period, and continued from generation to generation, rather spasmodically, down to the first half of the 18th Century, when it for the last time blossomed into the *Parliament* of Southern India, in the Province of Malabar, and shortly disappeared all at once, as we shall presently show.

In the present chapter, therefore, I intend to place before the Reader, a *Bird's eye-view* of the continuity of the traditions of the Vedic Institutions of *Popular Assembly and Self-Government*, and exhibit the *Elective principle* and *Representative form* of Government in the Brāhmanic Constitutional Monarchy of Ancient and Medieval Ind.

We have already shown that *the Elective principle*, in the *choice of a king*, existed even

in the times of the Rig-Veda and the Atharva Veda, some thousands of years before (*vide ante pp 125, 131*). As such, therefore, the King used to be actually *elected* and enthroned from time to time (R. V. X. 124.8; X. 173.1; X. 173.4; Atharva Veda III. 4.2). In like manner, during the period of Rámáyana also, the same *elective* principle appears to have been in full swing, in as much as, we meet with plenty of such references in the great Epic of Rámáyana, every now and then. For instance, king Dasharatha called all the peoples of his vast Empire, representing the various classes and creeds, trades and guilds (नानानगरवास्तव्यान्पृथग्जानपदानपि । समानिनाय मेदिन्यां..... । Rámáyana II.1.46), and convened the Popular Assembly (ततः परिषदं सर्व-मामंत्र्य वसुधाधिपः Rám. II.2.1), in view of investing Râma with the ensigns of royalty, offering the royal sceptre to the Crown Prince and heir apparent, and entrusting him with the reins of Government, as he (Dasharatha) was himself worn out with the cares and burdensome duties of ruling the Empire (परिश्रान्तोऽस्मि लोकस्य गुर्वी धर्मधुरं वहन् ॥ Rám. II. 2.9). After this was done, the King requested the representatives of the people assembled, to make their own *choice of the would-be-Sovereign*, declare their wishes, and announce the result to the world,

यदिदं मेऽनुरूपार्थं मया साधुःसुमंत्रितम् ।

भवन्तो मेऽनुमन्यन्तां कथं वा करवाण्यहम् ॥ १५॥

(Rāmāyaṇa. II. 2.15. Nirṇ. Sâ. Ed.)•

And the various *representatives*, after expressing (इच्छामः) their consent,¹ made their choice of Rāma, and *elected* him as *King-Emperor* of India and successor of Dasharatha, as he was in every way duly qualified to hold the royal office and wield the sceptre of the Empire.

But, this is not the one and the only, or even a solitary instance of the kind, in which the *Representatives* of the people and of our nation were required to *elect* and proclaim their king, according to the most ancient tradition and usage, that obtained from the hoary times and even the *Tertiary Period*. For, there appear various occasions, on which the King was, as a matter of course, required to be *elected*, and [was therefore *actually elected*, and then] proclaimed as *Sovereign* and *Ruler* of all, by the people and the nation's will. These facts,

1 समेत्य ते मंत्रयितुं सम्प्रागतबुद्धयः ।

अनुश्रुत्य मनसा ज्ञात्वा वृद्धं दशरथं वृषम् ॥ २०

अनेकवर्षसाहस्रो वृद्धस्त्वमासि पार्थिव ।

स रामं युवराजानमाभिषिञ्चस्व पार्थिवम् ॥ २१ ॥

इच्छामो हि महाबाहुं रघुवीरं महाबलम् ।

गजेन महतायान्तं रामं वृत्रावृत्ताननम् ॥ २२ ॥

ते तमृजुर्महात्मानः । पीरजानपदैः सह ।

बहवो वृष कल्याणशुभाः सन्ति सुतस्य ते ॥ २६ ॥

(Rāmāyaṇa II. 2),

therefore, being extremely pertinent to the subject in hand, it would certainly not be out of place to refer to them here, rather in detail, for corroboration, and for fortifying our conclusions. We, accordingly, proceed to give a few particulars in respect of the matter.

After the banishment of Rāma, along with his brother Laxmaṇa, king Dasharatha died of broken heart and overwhelming grief ; and his two younger sons Bharata and Shatrughna having been absent in the territory of their maternal uncle, there was none on the spot who could rightly occupy the royal throne, for the time being. The ministers (राजकर्तारः) therefore, who were entrusted with the administration of the Empire, called together the *Representatives* of the Popular Assembly (सभा), and asked them to *elect* their king from amongst the descendants of Ikshváku (इक्ष्वाकु), as without a ruler, the nation, they thought, would be ruined. The people, thereupon, with unanimous consent, empowered Vasishtha, the royal Priest, to *elect* one of the royal blood, or some other person that was entitled in every way, to wield¹ the kingly sceptre.

1 * * * समेत्य राजकर्तारः सभामीडुर्दिजातयः ॥ २ ॥

इक्ष्वाकुणामिहाद्यैव काश्चिद्राजा विधीयताम् ।

अराजकं हि नो राष्ट्रं विनाशं समवाप्नुयात् ॥ ८ ॥

कुमारमिक्ष्वाकुमुतं तथान्यं त्वमेव राजानमिहाभिषेचय ॥ १८ ॥

(Rāmāyaṇa. II. 67).

Vasishtha, then, in accordance with the *will of the nation*, immediately sent for Bharata and Shatrughna, and the former having been the elder of the two, the representatives of the people as also the ministers of the Empire, after *electing*¹ him, requested him to accept the crown-

But, more than this, even in the kingdom of the monkeys, *the principle of election of the king* by the race, appears to have as well obtained, and was in full swing. Thus, we find Sugrīva—Chief of the monkeys—actually *elected as king*, by his tribe (पौरैः) and responsible ministers (मन्त्रिभिरेव च), when Vāli had disappeared for a year, and he having not been found in any place, nor his whereabouts obtained during that long period, *election* and consecration of a new king was thought expedient, and even necessary. For, says Sugrīva to his brother Vāli, that he (Sugrīva) was *elected and crowned* as king, much against his will (अभिषिक्तो न कामेन), by his people and ministers,² as he (Vāli) had not turned up, and could not be found or seen any where, for over a year.

- 1 समेत्य राजकर्तारो भरतं वाक्यमब्रुवन् ॥ १ ॥
 त्वमद्य भव नो राजा राजपुत्र महायशः ॥ २ ॥
 अभिषेचनिकं सर्वमिदमादाय राघव ।
 प्रतीक्षते त्वां स्वजनः श्रेणयश्च वृषात्मज ॥ ४ ॥
 राज्यं ग्रहाण भरत पितृपैतामहं ध्रुवम् ।
 अभिषेचय चात्मानं पाहि चास्मान्नरर्षभ ॥ ५ ॥

(Rāmāyaṇa. II. 79.)

- 2 तस्माद्देशादपाक्रम्य किङ्किषां प्रानिःशङ्कुनः ।
 विषादात्त्वहं मां दृष्ट्वा पौरैर्मन्त्रिभिरेव च ॥ ६ ॥
 अभिषिक्तो न कामेन तन्मैक्षतुं त्वमर्हसि ।..... ॥ ७ ॥

(Rāmāyaṇa. IV. 10.)

Now coming to the times of the Mahā-Bhārata, we come across the same old, not to say hoary, tradition of making *election of the king*, and find it tacitly acted upon. Since, it seems, that it had taken firm and deep root in the Political Institutions of our Aryan nation. The people therefore had, with one accord, declared the eldest of the Pāndavas, as having been the fittest for the throne of Hastināpur, saying, " We *elect him*, consecrate him, and proclaim him King-Emperor to-day " (ते वयं पांडव-ज्येष्ठं...अभिषिचाम साध्वय). As the original¹ is very interesting, I quote it in the Foot-note, here below, *in extenso*.

Thus, the *election of the king* having become an established custom, nay, a settled fact and a sheer necessity as it were, both by traditional usage and the long-continued practice of hoary antiquity, one more and a further constitutional check seems to have been imposed on the *Sovereign-Powers* of the king, even during the times of the Code of Manu, and this can never be too highly praised for the great wisdom and deep

-
- 1 गुणैः सधुदितान्दृष्ट्वा पौराः पांडुसुतांस्तदा ।
 कथयांचकिरे तेषां गुणान्संसरतु भारत ॥ ४ ॥
 राज्यप्राप्तिं च संप्राप्तं ज्येष्ठं पांडुसुतं तदा ।
 कथयन्ति स्म सभूय चत्वरेषु सभासु च ॥ ५ ॥
 ते वयं पांडवज्येष्ठं तरुणं वृद्धशीलिनम् ।
 अभिषिचाम साध्वय सत्यकारुण्यबोद्धिनम् ॥ ८ ॥

(Mahā Bhārata, I. 152. S. I. T. E.)

foresight involved in it, as it asks him *to always consult his responsible ministers* (मंत्रहैर्मन्त्रिभिः) and the *representatives of the Popular Assembly or Public Body* (सभाम्), where always he has to take his seat.

Evidently, the main object in consulting the ministers and the representatives was to ensure, by all means, the security and the prosperity of the entire nation, as on these, mainly depended the happiness of the king (सुसंय-हीतराष्ट्रो हि पार्थिवः सुखमेधते ॥ म० स्मृ० ७. ११३). Now, the *unit* of our Aryan Empire was the *village*, while the *Popular Assembly* of our nation was represented by the *Village Communities*. It was for this reason that a net-work was gradually framed for securing first the interests of villages and of the village-communities, by taking into confidence the *Village-Elders*, who were the *Representatives* of the various communities. These, in course of time, by their love of labour and energetic performance of duties, enlarged their sphere of action ; and as their influence was naturally felt everywhere, the several villages and the Village-Communities found it necessary to form themselves into groups, for *united action* and appointment of their respective representatives, for redress of grievance and for ensuring prompt attention to their growing needs.

These Village Communities, in course of time, having established all the crafts in their villages, that were necessary for their usual wants, as they had variety of interests, had become independent of all foreign relations, as far as possible ; and *the village-communities* thus served, as but *little Republics*. Nay, as they had *commanded all the resources*, all be it to a limited extent, they had every thing that they wanted within themselves, without in the least depending upon any one else, outside these *Miniature Republics*. These, therefore, were, and have since been naturally supposed, even by great statesmen of Europe, to be *the Sheet-anchor of Indian state-craft*, especially as they were in every way *self-governing* and *self-contained* .

Moreover, there are, even now, in many an Indian village, the twelve *Alotees*¹ (१२ अलोर्ती) and the twelve *Balotees* (१२ बलोर्ती), which but signify the marvellous *distribution* and *division of labour*, or perfect arrangements for supplies of food and fodder, fuel and commodities. (अन्न-पानेन्धनादीनि.....Manu's Code. VII. 118), trade and guilds, the priest and the astrologer,

1. For detailed particulars, the Reader is requested to see the Author's Historical Work—"The Hindu Empire" or *Bhāratiya Sāmrajya* (भारतीय साम्राज्य) in Marathi, Vol. V. pp 87 @ 159, the entire work being in twenty-two volumes, of which eleven have been published till now.

the washerman and the barber, the bricklayer and the pot-maker, the gold-smith and the black-smith, the carpenter and the sewer, the oil-man and the watchman, the Mahâr and the Mâng, the craftsman and the labourer (कारुकादिग्राहक-
 श्रैवशूद्राश्चात्मोपजीविनः। Manu's Code. VII. 138), as also arrangements for conservancy, supervision, and lots of other things. In this way, these Village Communities appear on the very face of them to be *well organised and self-acting*, even at the present day, in some places, in as much as, they contain an almost complete establishment of all occupations and trades, required for satisfying ordinary wants. This, therefore, naturally enables them to continue their collective life, without in the least asking for assistance from any body whatever, and even without depending upon others.

Thus, the village communities, in the very nature of things, "seem to last where nothing else lasts," as observed by Sir Charles Metcalfe. (*Vide* Report of the Select Committee, House of Commons, 1832. Vol. III, App 84. p. 331). But, more than this, they appear to be pregnant with interest at every point, and even easily open to our observation. A general control, therefore, over these small *Republics* or *miniature States*, nay over every village," which, as rightly remarked by

Grant Duff, the author of the history of the Mahráttás, "is a small state in miniature," was always required for the benefit of all. Consequently, a king used to be *elected*, who could effectually wield the sceptre in all the branches of administration ; though, the ordinary supervision was usually made by a subordinate and yet very important staff of village officers (ग्रामस्याधिपति...Manu's Code. VII. 115), as also of Revenue and Magisterial functionaries invested with greater powers, heavier responsibilities, and awful authority over larger areas, according to necessity (सर्वार्थचिन्तकम् । उच्चैः स्थानं घोररूपं ...Manu's code. VII. 121).

In short, Manu's Code¹ affords a very grand and beautiful, not to say complete picture of our remarkable polity during those ancient times, and a detailed account of each branch of administration mentioned therein would certainly not be out of place. But, our limited space forbids us to do so. It may, however, be mentioned in passing, with a heavy sigh and deep regret, that disruption of this very *useful Institution* of Village communities is fast approaching, and India herself is slowly but surely losing every thing that is characteristic of her.

1 In respect of the Institutions and the Code of Manu, Muir writes as follows :—It was "written at a time when the Brahmanical system was fully developed". (Muir's Original Sanskrit Texts. Vol II. Ed. 1871. p. 305. Foot-note).

If, however, the Reader thinks I have exaggerated, I only beg to place before him a few extracts from the remarks made by illustrious statesmen and experienced administrators of the West. For, says Sir W. Wedderburn, as follows :—

“ And the late Sir James Caird regards the disruption of the mutually helpful bond of village society as the most fatal misadventure that can befall the people in their struggle for life”. While Sir Henry Maine, in his “ Village Communities in the East and the West ”, observes that, “ Just as according to the Brahmanical theory each of the Indian sacred rivers loses in time its sanctity, so India itself is gradually losing every thing which is characteristic of it.” (p 24. New Edition). And further on he says that, “ It is by its indirect and for the most part unintended influence that the British power metamorphoses and dissolves the ideas and social forms underneath it ; nor is there any expedient by which it can escape the duty of rebuilding upon its own principles that which it unwillingly destroys ”.

But, to return to the subject in hand. It must ever be carefully remembered, that the one great and essential feature of our ancient polity was *self-dependence* and *self-reliance*, which having been based upon the solid foundation of the supremely *representative character* of the

Village Council, and having been *well organised* and *self-acting*, had blossomed into *self-Government*, and engendered extreme love of the Village-Community, and eventually of the whole country and the entire nation. Now, as observed before (pp 139, 144, 145), the nation had, by traditional usage and custom, acquired the ever memorable right of *electing their own king*. The existence of the crown, therefore, solely depended upon the *good-will of the people*. The king, in the circumstances, had to *propitiate the people* by endeavouring to secure their lasting good; while their protection from internal troubles and external dangers had become his *first duty* and *a sacred trust*. Thus, in the Code of Manu, we often find very great prominence and supreme importance attached to the king's duty of protecting¹ his people, and ensuring the security of their lives and property.

And evidently, as a natural consequence, the King who does not care to perform *this primary* and *most sacred duty* is always doomed, and the wise Law-giver—Manu has thus sealed his fate :—

1 वर्णानामाश्रमाणां च राजा सुहोऽभिरक्षितः ॥ २५ ॥

... .. राजा ... पालयन्मजाः ।

न निवर्तेत संग्रामास्कात्रं धर्ममनुस्मरन् ॥ ८७ ॥

संग्रामेष्वनिवर्तिष्वं मजानां चैव पालनम् ।

सुश्रूषा ब्राह्मणानां च राजा श्रेयस्करं पश्य ॥ ८८ ॥

तेभ्यो (नामशठेभ्यो) रक्षोक्षिमाः मजाः ॥ १२३ ॥

(The Code of Manu. VII, 35, 87, 88, 123).

शरीरकर्षणात्प्राणाः क्षीयन्ते प्राणिनां यथा ।

तथा राज्ञामपि प्राणाः क्षीयन्ते राट्कर्षणात् ॥

(Manu's Code. VII. 112).

Herein, therefore, lies the open secret that, "*the King is for the People* " ; "*Not the people for the King* " ; and we find its *indelible prints* in the Code of Manu (VII. 40, 41, 42), where, the *making and unmaking*¹ of kings, obviously rested with the people, and the kings had to reap the fruits of their good conduct and popularity or otherwise, as in the case of Prithu² or Manu,³ and Vena³ or Nahusha³, respectively.

We have already made reference to *Self-reliance*, by observing that it was the very *back-bone* of our *Village-Community* and the *Popular Assembly*, which may be said to be the *Republican Institutions of Self-Government*. Now, this *Self-reliance* had the two-fold effect. In the first place, it served to create more confidence in our own action and self-exertion ; and secondly, it made us view with extreme contempt our own lethargy and inaction. Thus, our inability to help or provide for ourselves, naturally became repugnant to our self-acting notions, and highly offensive to our *self-governing ideas*. The

1 सहवोऽविनयाज्ज्ञानं राजानः सपरिच्छदाः ॥

वमस्या अपि धृष्टमने विनयात्पतिपेदिरे ॥ ४० ॥

2 पृथुस्तु विनयाद्वाज्यं प्राप्तवान्मदुरेव च ॥ ४२ ॥

3 वेनो विनयोऽविनयाज्ज्ञानं बभूवैवपाथिवः ।...॥ ४१ ॥ (मं. सू. अ० ७).

consciousness, therefore, of our own weakness, at once tended to generate the true spirit of *Self-dependence*, and in course of time not only freely developed it, but gave rise to *self-action* and *self-control*.

We have so far seen, how this spirit of *self-control* and *self-action* of our Vedic ancestors had made their *name and fame*, and carved out for themselves beautiful and stupendous *Empire*. (pp 130, 131). Besides, it will also be noticed, that even during the period of the Law-giver Manu, much was achieved, in this respect, as the *Self-governing principle* seems to have been fully developed, and even rigorously acted up to. For, the Code of Manu, as observed before, repudiates in emphatic terms the idea of dependence on others, and highly eulogises *self-dependence* and *Self-Reliance*, (ante p 63).

Chapter V.
The Buddhistic Period,
The spread of Republican Institutions,
AND
The Traditional King-Election.

As we pass the Vedic Period and come down to the Buddhistic times, we find the gradual spread of the Republican Institutions, the democratic spirit asserting itself throughout the land, the growth of popular suffrages making steady progress, the people's rights greatly respected, and our Nation's traditional privilege of *electing* their king continued as before.

Here, then, we have a wider view of the political horizon of Ind. Here, it is, that we come across more vivid glimpses and glaring perspective of her ancient polity; and *here* it is, that we see face to face brighter vistas of *her capacity for Self-Government*, and of its *representative character*. For, we observe that during this period, the administrative business of the people was carried on by Republican Institutions or *Popular Assemblies*, where, as we see, the interests of the various communities which formed the nation *were represented*; and it is in these *Popular Assemblies* or *Republican Institutions*, that we first see the *seeds of Parliament* sown in Northern India, which, as we shall presently

show, finally blossomed into a full fledged Parliament called "*Kottam*" (कोट्टम् Sans. कोट्टक) in the middle of the Eighteenth Century, in Southern India, which forcibly attracted the attention of even European factors, as all the ingredients of *Self-Government* and the requisite elements of *Constitutional Administration* were present therein, and the Vedic fabric of *Limited* or *Constitutional Monarchy* was vividly perceived.

The *Popular Assembly* or the North-Indian Representative Body of Kapilavastu (कपिलवस्तु), at which important public functions were executed, and where questions of national interest were discussed, was designated *Santhágára* or Mote Hall, and Professor Rhys Davids calls it "*a Parliament.*" It would, therefore, certainly be interesting to give here some idea of the view which European *savants* take of this period, and produce requisite evidence in the matter.

Professor Rhys Davids in his history of "Buddhist India" writes, "In those parts of India which came very early under the influence of Buddhism, we find, besides a still surviving number of small aristocratic republics, four kingdoms of considerable extent and power." (p 1, Edition 1903). He further adds that, "the earliest Buddhist records reveal the survival, side by side with more or less powerful monar-

chiefs, of republics with either complete or modified independence." (p. 2 *Ibid*). The four powerful kingdoms referred to above, were as follows:—(1) Magadha, (2) Kosila, (3) Vamsha or Vatsa, and (4) Avanti. The first had its capital originally at Rājagriha, and subsequently at Pātaliputra. The second had it at Shrāvasti. The third at Koshambi, on the river Yamunā (Jumna). And the fourth had it at Ujjayini. In these immense territories and large dominions, there existed a very high level of civilisation, and people were sober, mannerly, and not generally depraved. In fact, there was no crime at all, and this naturally attracted the attention of the Westerners. For, such a thing as "*no crime*," in so large and populous an area, has been *simply a novel in the West*.

The towns and the villages, in general, enjoyed this boon of "*no crime*", and as these were *self-contained, self-governed, and self-organised*, they were but *miniature Republics* in the true sense of the expression. For, says Professor Rhys Davids, in his *Buddhist India* (Edition 1903) that, "we hear of no crime, and there was not probably very much, in the villages themselves—each of them a tiny self-governed republic" (p. 21 *Ibid*). Moreover, he calls this Republican Institution, *this Organised Body*, or this Public Assembly "*a Parliament*," and

says, as regards the execution of public functions, thus :— “ The administrative and judicial business of the clan was carried out in public assembly, at which young and old were alike present, in their common Mote Hall—(*Santhágára*), at Kapilavastu. It was at such a parliament, or palaver, that King Pasenadi’s proposition.....was discussed.” (*p. 19 Ibid.*). The Professor further continues that, “ A late tradition tells us how the criminal law was administered in the adjoining powerful confederate clan of the Vajjians, by a succession of regularly appointed officers,—“ Justices, lawyers, rehearsers of the law-maxims, the Council of representatives of the eight clans, the general, the vice-consul, and the Consul himself.” (*p 22 Ibid*).

Now, during pre-Buddhistic times, the people of Ind used to *elect* their own king, according to traditional custom and usage, handed down from the Rig-Vedic times of the Tertiary Period, to which we have had the occasion to refer several times before (*supra pp 131,139, 144, 145*); and even in the Buddhistic period, the same practice seems to have obtained. For, observes Professor Rhys Davids that, “ A single chief—how, and for what period chosen, we do not know—was *elected* as office-holder, presiding over the sessions, and, if no

sessions were sitting, over the State. He bore the title of *Rājā*, which must have meant something like the Roman Consul, or the Greek archon " (p. 19 *Ibid*).

I may here add that Buddhism commenced and flourished from the time of Gautama Buddha-the Great, of the Rajputa family, who promulgated Buddhistic religion. He was born in 622 B. C., and after embracing the order of an *ascetic* (संन्यासाश्रम), at the age of thirty in 592 B. C., began to preach the doctrine of Buddhism, immediately afterwards. This, however, was in its decline in the fourth century A. D. (*vide* Vincent Smith's "Early History of India." p 283. Ed. 1908).

So far then, as regards the extent of *Self-Government* in ancient Ind, during the Buddhistic period. Let us, therefore, see, if Foreigners had ever noticed this very important fact, and if so, whether there is any evidence to that effect, in the records of Western nations.

We observe that, after the Maurya Emperor Chandragupta had expelled Macedonian garrisons from the Panjab and even Sind, nay, after he had repulsed and humbled Seleukos Nikator or the Conqueror, the latter had to retire and conclude a humiliating peace with the former. Soon after the conclusion of this peace

in 303 B. C., Seleukos had sent Megasthenes to the court of Chandragupta, as his Greek envoy. He had resided at the Emperor's capital Pâtali-putra (Pâtnâ), for a considerable period, and had, during his residence there (B. C. 306), compiled a very elaborate account¹ of the geography of India, her products and industries, her people and their Institutions, manners, customs, &c. In this account, the Village-System is well described, and the Village Communities are mentioned as but rural units and little *independent* Republics, aptly said to be *self-contained* and *self-governed* (*vide supra pp 146 @ 149*).

Now, in respect of the administration of a large Hindu town, the Greek Ambassador-Megasthenes gives the following description :—

“ Those who have charge of the city are divided into six bodies of five each. (And this division into bodies of five seems to be connected with the *Panchâyat* system). The members of the first look after every thing relating to the industrial arts. Those of the second attend to the entertainment of foreigners. To these they assign lodgings, and they keep watch over their modes of life, by means of those persons

¹ Fragments of the account of Megasthenes have been collected and edited by Schwanbeck, under the title of *Megasthenis Indika*, and these have been translated by Mc Crindle in *Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian*.

whom they give to them for assistance. They escort them on the way when they leave the country, or in the event of their dying, they forward their property to their relatives. They take care of them when they are sick, and if they die, bury them. The third body consists of those who inquire when and how births and deaths occur, with the view not only of levying a tax, but also in order that births and deaths among both high and low, may not escape the cognizance of Government. The fourth class superintends trade and commerce. Its members have charge of weights and measures, and see that the products in their season are sold by public notice. No one is allowed to deal in more than one kind of commodity, unless he pays a double tax. The fifth class supervises manufactured articles, which they sell by public notice. What is new is sold separately from what is old, and there is a fine for mixing the two together. The sixth and the last class consists of those who collect the tenths of the prices of the articles sold". (*Vide* The Imperial Gazetteer of India, from which the extract is taken. Vol IV. p 282. Edition 1907).

Chapter VI.

The Post-Buddhistic Period.

Tribal Republics,

AND

Popular Election.

Even after the decline of Buddhism, and during the illustrious period of the Gupta Emperors, viz. the fourth and the fifth centuries A. D., we find *small Republics* in full swing, and the democratic spirit rampant, here and there. For, says Vincent Smith, in this respect, as follows:—"The Punjab, Eastern Rājputāna, and Mālvā for the most part, were in possession of tribes or clans, living under Republican Institutions."....."In Alexander's time, these regions (i. e. both the banks of the Satlaj, and the central parts of the Punjab), were similarly occupied by autonomous tribes, then called the Malloi, Kathaioji, and so forth." (*vide* "The Early History of India." Edition 1908. p. 271).

Now, passing the Gupta period, we come to the times of Emperor Shree Harsha, A. D. 606-648; and here again, we find Ind announcing to the world her principal and long cherished motto—"The King for the People". "Not the People for the King." And more than this, we notice her hoary traditions, in respect of the

right of *election* of the king by the nation, or *by the representatives of the people*, duly respected, as well as scrupulously observed, and the customary usage continued as before.

This custom of *election*, had, indeed, taken such a deep root in the hearts of the people of Ind, that even Prince Shilāditya, afterwards known as Emperor Shree Harsha, hesitated to accept the crown and the royal office of the King-Emperor, when invited by the Nobles and Councillors of the Empire to succeed to the throne of his brother Rājyavardhana, left vacant on account of the latter's treacherous murder by Shashānka, king of Central Bengal, as apparently he (Prince Shilāditya) seems to have desired king-ship, not by hereditary claims, but *by the election* of the people, and *with the consent of the representatives of the nation*. These facts, therefore, are, by all means, very noteworthy, and really interesting. Consequently, I make no apology to quote from Vincent Smith's early history of the period, in view of fortifying my conclusions. For, says he, " The ministers acting on the advice of Bhandi, a slightly senior cousin, who had been educated with the young princes, ultimately resolved to invite Harsha to undertake the responsibilities of the royal office. For some reason, which is not apparent on the face of the story, he scrupled

to 'express his consent, and it is said that he consulted a Buddhist oracle before accepting the invitation. Even when his reluctance, whether sincere or pretended, had been overcome by the favourable response of the oracle, he still sought to propitiate Nemesis by abstaining at first from the assumption of the kingly style, modestly designating himself as Prince Shilāditya ”.

“ These curious details indicate clearly that some unknown obstacle stood in the way of Harsha's accession, and compelled him to rely for his title to the crown, upon election by the nobles rather than upon his hereditary claims. There is reason to suppose that Harsha did not boldly stand forth as avowed king, until 612 A. D., when he had been five and a half or six years on the throne, and that his formal coronation or consecration took place in that year.” (*Vide* The Early History of India. Second Edition. pp 311, 312. By Vincent A. Smith).

We have, so far, produced before the Reader the requisite evidence available, in respect of *our ingrained habits of Self-Government* and *natural tendencies* in the matter of *election of the king by the people*, in Northern India, during the seventh century. We shall, therefore, turn our attention for a while to Southern India, for recording facts, in chronological order, and see for ourselves the state of things, as regards the

polity of the Hindus, that obtained there in the matter of the *election* of the king by the people or the nation.

We know that Nandivarman was a king of the Pallavas, and had succeeded Narasimha-Varman II, about 720 A. D. He was not lineally descended from that prince, but was his collateral relative, having been descended from the brother of King Simha-Vishnu. Notwithstanding this, however, Nandivarman obtained the Crown and sovereignty over the Pallavas, because, he was *elected* king by the people. The matter thus became by far the most prominent, and naturally attracted the careful attention, it deserved, of Western Historians. Mr. Vincent A. Smith has, accordingly, recorded the fact in "The Early History of India," as follows:—
 "The change in the line of succession is stated to have been the result of a *popular election*." (Second revised Edition. p 427).

Thus, it will be perceived that the traditions in respect of the *election* of the King by the People had continued from the Vedic Period down to the eighth century A. D., almost uninterruptedly. This fact, therefore, will speak for itself, as regards the Rig Vedic motto—
 ध्रुवो राजाविशामयम् । R. V. X. 173. 4—"The King for the People." "Not the People for the King." (Supra pp 137 @ 146).

Chapter VII.

The Village Administration Under The Chola Emperors.

AND

The Election Rules.

In the preceding Chapters, we presented to the Reader the phenomenon of *the election of the King by the People* for the government of the country. In the present Chapter, therefore, we would advert to the *election* by them of their own *Representatives* for administering the affairs of the village, and give *in extenso* some of the most important Rules framed for purposes of their *Election*, during the reign of the illustrious Chola Emperor Parântaka I (A. D. 907-948).

Before, however, giving the Rules, I think it necessary to observe here that, the Chola Emperor was not the first to start the system of Village Administration, by appointing Committees for the autonomy of the village and the management of all internal affairs. Because, even prior to the commencement of the reign of Parântaka I, inscriptions appear to have been in existence; and these amply prove the establishment of the *Village-Self-Government* in previous times. For instance, the Uttara Mallur Inscriptions indicate keen interest taken in the local Administration. While, the great men of the "Annual

Comittee, referred to in the Ukkal Inscriptions of hisreign (Parântaka I. A. D. 907-948), of the tenth century, are mentioned as trustees of an Endowment, in an inscription of the Ganga-Pallava¹ King of the ninth century A. D. Again, Village Assemblies have been alluded to in several of the inscriptions of the Pallava Period, supposed for palæographical reasons to be as old as the Second Century A. D., although recent expert opinion is disposed to assign to them a date two or three centuries later. There is also another inscription, which purports to be a copper-plate grant from the Krishnâ District of the Eastern Châlukyas, belonging to the first half of the tenth century A. D.; and this makes a mention of Pancha-vâri (पंचवारी) and Vâra-goshthi (वारगोष्ठी), i. e. Committee and Assembly.

Besides, it further appears from the Tanjore Inscriptions of the Chola King Râjarâja I (A. D. 985-1013) that over 150 villages had Assemblies of their own, while in 40 other villages, the villagers themselves, as a body, used to manage their own affairs, without any external assistance. All this, therefore, obviously proves the fact that Village Communities were in working order, and that the system of Republican Institutions or *Local Self-Government* was in full swing almost throughout

¹ Vide South Indian Inscriptions. Vol III. p 2, as also Epigr. India. Vol IX. p 86. Foot.-note 9.

Southern India, although it is quite possible that difference in detail might have existed in numerous places. As for example, the number of Committees of Village Assemblies does not seem to have been the same in all villages, probably, owing to the fact that varied circumstances and local conditions were instrumental in settling the number.

With this brief review of *Self-Government* and *Republican Institutions*, of the period preceeding the Chola Emperors, we shall return to the *Election Rules* of their times.

The ambitious Chola king—Parântaka I—who reigned¹ from 907 to 948 A. D., has left very interesting inscriptions of his reign, and these afford a very minute and matter-of-fact idea in respect of the *Local-Self-Government*, not to say of the effective administration of his Empire. It would, therefore, not be out of place to quote from Mr. Vincent Smith's "Early History of India", and give a short extract therefrom, as it will certainly repay perusal. Says the historian :—"Certain long inscriptions of Parântaka I are of especial interest to the students of village institutions, by reason of the full details which they give of the manner in which local affairs were administered by well-

¹ *Vide* South Indian Inscriptions. Vol II. p. 381. Uttara Mallur Inscriptions p 134.

organised local committees, or *pāṇchāyats*, exercising their extensive administrative and judicial powers under royal sanction. It is a pity that this apparently excellent system of local self-government, really popular in origin, should have died out ages ago. Modern governments would be happier if they could command equally effective local agency." (Second Edition. p. 418).

We shall now endeavour to give some particulars of vital importance, in respect of the *Local Self-Government of the villages and the countries* comprised in the extensive Empire of Parāntaka I, the Epigraphic material of whose reign has fortunately supplied us with the requisite, nay *invaluable* details, found in about forty stone Inscriptions in Tamil, ranging from 909 to 948 A. D. The Ukkal Inscriptions, that belong to the Tenth Century of the Christian Era, appear to be of special interest to the student of *Local Self-Government*, with its uninterrupted traditions of great, nay of hoary *antiquity*, chiefly for the reason that they afford an insight into *the indigenous administrative talents* of the Hindus, shown in the government of Southern India. They, moreover, exhibit to our view, (1) the marvellous powers of organization of the indigenous Rulers, (2) their many *well-matured-schemes*, (3) the

Popular or General Assembly (महासभा), (4) the minute rules for the appointment of various Committees, (5) the qualifications necessary for membership, (6) the disqualifications that came in the way of membership, (7) the method of *election* of the members of Committees, (8) the contemplated annual change of office-bearers, &c., &c..

Although these and other rules belong to the tenth Century A. D., the system itself of *Self-Government* which was then launched, and which was instrumental in the construction of the rules, appears to have had its seed sown sometime back, (ante pp 165, 166), and even before it thus budded and blossomed, or showed such unmistakable *self-governing* powers and administrative aptitude. The *Popular Assembly* of the rules under consideration, consisted of several *Committees*, of which six seem to have been mentioned in the rules, as follows :— (1) Annual Supervision Committee, (2) Tank Supervision Committee, (3) Garden Supervision Committee, (4) Justice Supervision Committee, (5) Gold Supervision Committee, and (6) the *Pancha-Vâra-Vâriyam* Committee. The aforesaid fifth or Gold Supervision-Committee, probably regulated the *currency*, while the last or the Sixth, supervised the work of the remaining five committees.

The defective or imperfect rules found in the earlier Inscriptions, having been brought to the notice of the King, these were obviously recast, and the improvement that was deemed necessary at the time, made therein, as seems clear from the later Inscriptions.

All the members of the various committees *were*, by the rules framed, *bound* to render, to the Popular Assembly, accounts of their stewardship, which was to last only for a year. And the rule in respect of the annual change of office-bearers, was certainly beneficial under proper safe-guards.

There were Arbitrators and others for writing accounts. But, this work having been supposed to be of great importance, the appointment to this office was made of those persons only, who had earned their wealth by honest means.

The method adopted for *election* of members was by casting lots; and this seems to have been common in ancient times. The presence of a Priest on which special stress is laid, as also the choice of a lad to take out the voting-papers from the box, were obviously meant for eliminating the human element, and introducing, in its stead, the divine one, in the matter of *election*. After scrutiny, the members *elected* were looked upon

as candidates that were successful, only through divine intervention.

In short, the *Election rules* seem to be minute even to a detail, and show, on the very face of them, that *Self-Government*, during the period of the Chola Emperors, was highly systematized, and that the same was in full swing, some centuries before. Nay, this *Self-Governing* system had obtained not only in the Tamil districts, but was also prevalent in the Telugu countries, and had even prevailed over a considerable other portion of Southern India. (Vide *Epigraphical Reports of the Government of Madras for 1898-99*, Nos 922, 923; as also *Inscriptions Nos 1, 2 of 1898* ; Report, *Archaeological Survey of India*, 1904, 5 ; and *South Indian Inscriptions*, Vol III, Part I, Ukkal).

I shall now give here a few important specimens of the Rules framed in respect of *Self-Government*, during the reign of Parāntaka I, especially as the Uttarmallur¹ and Ukkal² Inscriptions obviously show and prove in every way, that the Emperor had not only taken personal interest in his foreign policy and the extension of his Empire, but used to pay undivided attention even to the internal administration of his wide dominions.

1. Vide infra p 172, Foot-note 2.

2. Near Māmandur, on the road between Conjeeveram and Wandiwash.

The Rules commence thus:—"This was the way in which, we (the Members of the Assembly) made rules for forming, once every year, (1) Annual Supervision Committee, (2) Garden Supervision Committee, and (3) Tank Supervision Committee.¹

(1) There shall be thirty wards in Uttarmallur.

(2) In these thirty wards, those that live in each ward shall assemble and *elect* eligible men.

The Qualifications required for one eligible are these :—

(a) One with one-fourth *Veli* of tax-paying land. (A *Veli* being six and two third Acres).

(b) One having a house built on his own site.

(c) One aged below seventy and above thirty five.

(d) One knowing Mantra-Brâhmaṇa, and able to teach it.

1. I may here mention that, three more Committees were subsequently added ; viz (4) Justice Supervision Committee, (5) Gold Supervision Committee, and (6) the Pancha-Vâra-Vârtyam Committee. (*Vide ante* p 169).

2. Uttarmallur is a village 10½ miles north-west of the Madurantakam Station, on the Chingalpat-Villupuram section of the South-Indian Railway.

- (e) One owning even one-eighth (Veli) of land, in case he has learnt one Veda and one of the four *Bhâshyas*, and can explain it (to others).
- (f) Even with the aforesaid qualifications, one is eligible for election, only if he is conversant with business, and conducts himself according to sacred rules.
- (g) One who has acquired wealth by honest means, whose mind is pure, and who has not been on any of the Committees for the last three years.

The Disqualifications coming in the way of eligibility for election may briefly be stated thus :—

- (a) One who having been on any of the Committees, has not submitted the accounts.
- (b) The sons of the younger and elder sisters of the mother of the said person.
- (c) The sons of his paternal aunts and maternal uncles.
- (d) The brothers of his mother.
- (e) The brothers of his father.

- (f) His brothers.
- (g) His fathers-in-law.
- (h) The brothers of his wife.
- (i) The husbands of his sisters.
- (j) The sons of his sisters.
- (k) His sons-in-law.
- (l) His father.
- (m) His sons.
- (n) One against whom illicit sexual intercourse, or the first four of the five great sins have been recorded ; viz. (1) killing a Brâhman, (2) drinking intoxicating liquors, (3) theft, (4) adultery with the wife of a spiritual Teacher, and (5) associating with any one guilty of those crimes.
- (o) All his various relations specified above.
- (p) One who has been an out-caste, or associated with low people, unless he performed the expiatory ceremonies.
- (q) One who is foolhardy.
- (r) One who has stolen or plundered the property of others.

- | | |
|--|--|
| (s) One who has taken
forbidden dishes. | } These seem to
be excluded for
life, as they
do not become
eligible for elec-
tion, even after
performance of
expiation-cere-
mony. |
| (t) One who has com-
mitted sins. | |
| (u) One who had been
a village pest. | |
| (v) One guilty of sex-
ual intercourse. | |

These, in short, were some of the rules,¹ promulgated by Emperor Parāntaka I, in view of making his administration more efficient, and even with a real desire to allow his own people to have a share in the government of the Empire, by gradually *initiating* them in the arduous responsibilities and cares thereof, as they were enormous, not to say multifarious, ceaseless, and exhausting.

The eleventh and the subsequent centuries, witnessed the most disastrous predatory Islamic incursions into India, when chaos, plunder, iconoclasm, disorder, and misrule reigned supreme, followed by the permanent Mogal occupation of the country in the sixteenth century. Of the Mogal emperors, the reign of illustrious Akbar was exceptionally good. But, with all that, he was still an autocrat, and *Constitutional Monarchy*, much less the idea of *Republican*

1. English translation of the Original in Tamil, has been gratefully borrowed from the Volume of *Epigraphic India*. (*The Author*).

Government, found no place in the Islam polity whatever. In fact, it was not till the beginning of the seventeenth Century, when the far famed Shivâji appeared on the scene, that any attempt was made at inaugurating Constitutional Monarchy. And it was Shivaji *the Great* who introduced into his kingdom the system of *Constitutional Government*, viz. the Ashta-Pradhân Scheme or the *popular Board of Administration*, which has its counterpart in the present Government of India, of which, therefore, we shall give the requisite details in the next Chapter.

Chapter VIII.

The Marāthā Constitutional Government.

OR

The Ashta-Pradhān System of Shivāji the Great.

In the present Chapter, I beg to present to the Reader the leading characteristics of the principles of *Constitutional Monarchy*, laid down by Shivāji the Great, who like Napoleon I, was a typical organiser of his period, and a builder of civil and military Institutions that deserve notice, as they were intended chiefly for Mahārāshtra or *the Great Nation*. He had a rare insight into the needs of the times, resourcefulness that is hardly found any where, and patriotism that was obviously in advance of the age. Moreover, he had conceived and worked out a system which had very far reaching consequences. For, he had created and even established a Council consisting of the highest officers of the State, in view of carrying on the Government, not by individual whims and caprices or the freaks of a single Ruler, but by a Board of capable men, for assisting the King in the proper discharge of his duties.

The Board of Administration established by Shivaji *the Great* in 1668-69 was known as *Ashta Pradhán*, that is, a Cabinet of eight Ministers or heads of departments, in which the *Peshwá* was Prime Minister, and was, next to the king, the recognised head of both the Civil and Military administration. The *Send Pati* or the Commander-in-chief was in charge of the Militia. *Pant Amátya* was the Finance Minister. *Pant Suchiv* was the Accountant General and Auditor. *Mantri* was in charge of the king's private affairs. The *Sumant* was the Foreign Secretary. *Panditrào* had charge of Ecclesiastical Department. While Sir Nyáyádhish was the Chief Justice, and had the charge of Judicial Department.

Thus, this *Ashta-Pradhán System*, or the Constitution of Government formed of eight Cabinet Ministers, was solely created by Shiváji, for the *well-being* of his people, for securing *national independence*, and for ensuring prosperity to his country. Naturally, therefore, Shiváji *the Great* was always considered by his nation to be *the King* amongst kings, who had ever appreciated the truism of the maxim:—“*The king for the people,*” “*Not the people for the king,*” as he had unremittingly endeavoured to work on these lines, by keeping constantly in view the principle involved therein, viz, the good

of his nation. In this respect, accordingly, the master-mind of Shivâji *the Great*, not only presents to our view his wonderful military genius, as also his exploits as a brave, intrepid, *daring*, and yet *far-seeing soldier*; but even as a *Civil Ruler*, he certainly has stronger claims upon our attention and gratitude. Because, he in reality shows *extraordinary talents* and *very marvellous powers of organisation*. Besides, as a builder of civil institutions amidst overwhelming difficulties, embarrassing circumstances, perplexing pressure from all sides, manifold and absorbing cares of Government, Shivâji stands second to none, especially as all his schemes enabled the country and the nation to pass unscathed, through all dangers that these had to encounter shortly after his death, and assert their claim to *national independence*, after constant struggle for about twenty years, with the whole power and prestige of the Mogal Empire.

The genius of Shivâji founded and carved out for the Indians "*the Mahrâtta Empire*." While his civil institutions, which, once more, side by side with the Moslem Regime, inaugurated *Constitutional Government*, are by far the most important and extremely interesting. In the circumstances, I cannot resist the temptation to quote from the late lamented Honourable Rao Bahadur Justice Rânade's historical work,

"Rise of the Maráthá Power," and give a few pithy extracts therefrom.

"These civil institutions deserve special study, because they display an originality and breadth of conception which he (Shiváji) could not have derived from the system of government then prevalent under Mahomedan or Hindu rule ".....p 115.

"He strove to secure the freedom of his own people, and unite them into one nation, powerful for self-defence and for self-assertion also".....p 116.

"The (Maráthá) Empire was knit together by the chain of these hill-forts, and they were its saviours in days of adversity." p 118.

"The Málvan fort and Kolaba were the places where the Maratha navy was fitted out for its expeditions by sea." p 119.

"Shiváji's system of Civil Government was distinguished from those which preceded it or succeeded it, in several important respects." p 131. And among others, "in the establishment of a Council of Ministers with their proper work allotted to them, and each directly responsible to the King in Council " p 132.

"That|(British) authority, when it obtained supremacy (in India), gave its deliberate preference to the principles laid down by Shiváji

over those which found favour with his successors ". p 141.

"The wisdom of Shiváji's principles has been thus vindicated, not only by the success which he himself achieved, but by the success which has attended the efforts of those who built their power upon the ruins of the Confederacy, which he had tried to knit together, and which broke up chiefly because Shiváji's successors departed from the lines of policy laid down by him for their guidance ". pp 141-2.

But, apart from the inauguration of the aforesaid system of Ashta-Pradhâna, or the Council of Eight Cabinet Ministers for Government of the Empire, Shiváji had also established *Pancháyats* or *Local Self-governing Committees*, which exercised extensive administrative and judicial powers. In fact, these *Pancháyats* meant in other words, *Local Self-Governing Village Communes*, and were really popular in origin, as, having been well-organised, they commanded influence in every village, and proved to be an effective local agency. Let us, therefore, see what foreigners speak of the system. And we find Mr. Grant Duff, rightly speaking of Shiváji and the systems of Government created by him, thus :—

"And nothing is more remarkable in regard to Shiváji, than the foresight with

which some of his schemes were laid, and the fitness of his arrangements for the genius of his countrymen". p 100.

" The judicial system of Shivaji in civil cases was that of Panchayat, which had invariably obtained in the country ".

" To assist in the conduct of his government, Shivaji established eight principal offices, p 105.

" Shivaji was certainly a most extraordinary person ; and, however justly many of his acts may be censured, his claim to high rank in the page of history must be admitted ".....

" Let us examine his internal regulations, the great progress he made in arranging every department in the midst of almost perpetual war-fare, and his successful stratagems for escaping or extricating himself from difficulty ; and whether planning the capture of a fort or the conquest of a distant country ; heading an attack or conducting a retreat ; regulating the discipline to be observed amongst a hundred horse, or laying down arrangements for governing a country ; we view his talents with admiration and his genius with wonder. " (p 132).

..." But, to sum up all, let us contrast his craft, pliancy, and humility, with his boldness, firmness, and ambition ; his power of inspiring

enthusiasm, while he showed the coolest attention to his own interest ; the dash of a partizan adventurer, with the order and economy of a statesman ; and lastly, the wisdom of his plans which raised the despised Hindus to sovereignty, and brought about their own accomplishment when the hand that had framed them was low in the dust." p 132. (History of the Mahrattas. By James Grant Duff. Third Edition).

Having made this passing reference in respect of Mahà-Râshtra or *The Great Nation*, for noting events in the order of chronology, we shall, in the next Chapter, turn our attention to Southern India, and see how things fared there in the matter of *Self-Government*, as also in the *election* of the King, and in keeping the latter within *constitutional limits*.

Chapter IX.

The Parliament of Malabar

AND

The Constitutional Monarchy of the Province.

The province of Malabár, or the Country of the Malayális, formerly presented a very unique and by far the most interesting aspect in the body politic of the Náyars, who claimed for themselves this noble appellation, and might as well be said to be the Kshatriya (क्षत्रिय) class of the Province. These, it seems, had, by their *Self-Government* and the *most valuable Political Institutions*, which, even Europeans admit, (*infra* p 192), resembled *Parliament*, served as useful checks upon the administration, and formed but enviable bulwarks against the oppression of their sovereigns, the despotic conduct of their ministers, or the tyranny of executive officers. They had thus not only secured peace, but ensured prosperity for their country, until the same was disturbed and destroyed by foreigners, who had neither sympathy for the people, nor any regard for their political freedom, nor even for their highly valued political institutions. As, however, these very people and their political institutions are extremely interesting and worthy to be studied, I intend offering to the Reader, as

far as possible, a tolerably correct view thereof, presently.

The word *Nāyar* seems to be a corruption of the Sanskrit word *Netārah* (नेतारः), meaning *Leaders*, and is derived from the root नी to lead. The *Nāyars*, therefore, were not only the *leaders* of their people—the Malayāli nation—but were practically the *protectors* of their country. In Johnston's "*Relations of the most famous kingdom in the world*" (1611), the *Nāyars* were eulogised as "gentlemen" and ready soldiers. Further on, the same work describes them thus:—"At seven years of age, they are put to school to learn the use of their weapons." "Their continual delight is in their weapon, persuading themselves that no nation goeth beyond them in skill and dexterity."

Besides, the *Nāyars* were described (1761 A. D.) by the British General—Sir Hector Munro—as follows :—"They point their guns well and fire them well also." But, says Mr. Logan, "The martial spirit of the *Nāyars* in these *piping times* of peace, has quite died out for want of exercise.....With a large increase in their numbers, and with comparative poverty for the large body of them, the race is fast degenerating." (Malabar Gazetteer. Vol. I. p 138).

The Náyars have, moreover, been said by Mr. Logan, in the Malâbâr Gazetteer (p IV, Preface. Volume I), to constitute a Hindu community of the purest and most characteristic type. And there was a time, when these Náyars were once at the head of the people of Calicut, and used to array themselves in defence of the rights, privileges, and usages of their Country, whenever these were *trampled under foot, or encroached upon, by the kings and their ministers.*

The *Nâd* or county was a congeries of *taras*, and these *taras* were simply *Village Republics*. But, the *Kottam* (कोटम्), on the other hand, constituted the most important *political institution* of the Náyars. For, it was an Assembly where the *Representatives* of the people gathered together for united action, and for guarding their common interest. As such, therefore, they naturally wielded immense power and influence. In fact, they set at naught such of the orders of the King as were unjust and unconstitutional in the very nature of things, and even punished the ministers, when they did "unwarrantable acts." Because, the Náyars, uptil the British occupation of the Province in 1792, were practically the *militia* and the *leaders of the people*. Perhaps, originally, they were organised into *Six Hundreds*, and each six hundred appears to have had assigned to it the duty of protecting all the

people in a *Nâd* or county, which, in turn, was split up into *Taras*, the *tara* having been the territorial *unit* of Civil Government and organisation, controlled by *Elders* styled *Karanavars*. But, in Travancore, the local chieftain was probably the headman of the local "*Six-Hundred*."

These having been the facts, we should not wonder, if the Political Institutions of the Province of Malabar were described as follows :—
 " From the earliest times therefore down to the end of the eighteenth century, the Náyár *Tara* and *Nâd* organisation kept the country from oppression and tyranny on the part of the rulers, and to this fact more than to any other is due the comparative prosperity, which the Malayáli country so long enjoyed, and which made Calicut, at one time, the great *emporium* of trade between the East and the West." (Malabár Gazetteer. Vol I. p 132).

The aforesaid *Kottam* or the *Popular Assembly*, discussed questions involving the interests of the nation, and had power to wage war or dictate terms of peace. In short, the Nâyars pre-eminently enjoyed their own *Self-Government*, managed their own affairs, and carried on the administration of the territory under their charge, without the least foreign interference in any matter whatever.

But, more than this, the Náyars strictly observed the traditional and the most important Hindu custom and usage of *electing* their own King, regarded the *Election Day* as one of great festivity, and declared to the world thereby, the acknowledged principle, nay, the grand maxim: viz "*The King for the People,*" "*Not the People for the King,*" that had come down to them from the R̥g-Vedic times (p 139). In respect, therefore, of this *election* of kings in the Kerala country or the Province of Malábár, I venture to place before the Reader a few authoritative details, as they will repay perusal. —"The tradition is that this festival (viz of the Mahá-Makham Day, that is, literally the Day of Great Sacrifice and of *Election*, every twelfth year) was instituted in the days of the emperors," (called Perumáls). This was prior to the Kollam Era, (that commenced from the 25th of August 825 A. D.); and "when the last Emperor (Cheraman Perumál) set out for Mecca and left the country without a head, the duty of celebrating it devolved on the raja of the locality where the festival used to take place,".....viz on the Arangott Raja, on account of his territory lying beyond the river Âr, and at some distance from Craganore,¹ the Emperor's head-quarters.

1 This word is the corruption of Kodungallur, of which the Greek metamorphosis seems to be Mauziria, while the transformation of the same in the deed of the Cochin Jews is Muyiri Kodu. (vide The Malabar Gazetteer. vol I. p. 192, Ed. 1887).

And this arrangement seems to have continued up to the twelfth or the thirteenth century A. D., when the power of the Zamorins (chiefly through Mahomedan influence, their arms, and trade) became supreme in all Keralam. "From this time down to the last celebration of the festival in 1743, the Zamorins were present at this festival as suzerains of all Keralam, including Travancore, which as a Malayali State only attained to the first rank shortly after the date of the last Mahà-Makham festival in 1743" (The Malabar Gazetteer. p 164).

In fact, the *Mahà-Makham* festival originally appears to have been the occasion for a *Kottam* or the *Popular Assembly of the Representatives* of the Province of Kerala, at which questions affecting the interests of the nation and public welfare were discussed and settled. But, subsequently, the practice obtained of *electing*, on this occasion, a new king every twelfth year; and Hamilton thus describes, in the beginning of the eighteenth century, the tradition of *King-election*, as was current in his time. Says he, "It was an ancient custom for the Samorin to reign but twelve years, and no longer. If he died before his term expired, it saved him a troublesome ceremony of cutting his own throat on a public scaffold erected for that purpose. He first made a feast for all his Nobility and

Gentry, who are very numerous. After the feast, he saluted his guests and went on the scaffold, and very decently cut his own throat in the view of the Assembly, and his body was, a little while after, burned with great pomp and ceremony, and Grandees elected a new Samorin. Whether that custom was a religious or a civil ceremony I know not, but it is now laid aside."

Mr. Jonathan Duncan was, as we know, Governor of Bombay for some time, and from his article about this Mahâ-Makham festival in the first volume of the Bombay Literary Society, it seems that the reign of each Perumal terminated every twelfth year, and that a new king was *elected* for another twelve years.

From the *Keralotpatti* (केरलोत्पत्ति), which is apparently a treatise on the origin and institutions of *Keral* country or Malâbâr Province, it seems that Chéramân Perumâl disappeared and went to Arabia, where he embraced Mahomedanism. After his retirement, his kingdom was divided amongst petty Rajas, and it was then that Zamorin became the most famous of the kings of Malâbâr, and had adopted the title of *Kunnalak-Kon*, or King of the Hills and Waves. The Sanskrit equivalent of the expression *Zamorin* is no doubt *Samudri*. But the Malayalis having not been able to pronounce

the word properly, corrupted it into various forms. such as *Samutiri*, *Tamutiri*, and *Samuri*; while the Europeans, by changing the initial "S" into "Z," called the king of Malabar by the appellation of *Zamorin*. It has been stated that, "The last King or Emperor of Malabar was one Cheraman Perumal who reigned at Kodungallur (Craganore)." (Malabar Gazetteer. Vol. I p 192). This Emperor (Perumal) once had a singular dream which, it has been supposed, converted him¹ to Islam faith, and persuaded him to travel to Arabia in A. D. 827, where at Zaphâr on the Arabian coast, he died in A. D. 832.

The divisions of the kingdom of the last Perumal, after he abdicated the throne and departed to Arabia, as also the polity of the Nâyars, and the efficient administration of the territories under their charge, have already been noticed (*supra* pp.184 @ 190). It would, therefore, not be out of place to state here the personal experiences and impressions of a Representative of the then Honorable East India Company, as he

1 The inscription on his tomb runs thus:—" Arrived at Zaphâr A. H. 212 (A. D. 827). Died there, A. H. 216 (A. D. 832)." Perumal is reported to have landed at Shahr, at some distance from Zaphâr, and to have changed his name to that of Abdul Rahman Sâmîrî, said to appear from his Tomb at Zaphâr. (Malabar Gazetteer. pp 196, 195, 193. Vol I. 1887).

was on the spot at the time, and had personally seen what was passing in and out of the Kerala Country. He had settled in the country of Malabar, in the middle of the Eighteenth Century (1746 A. D.), and was watching the working of the Náyar polity, the distribution of their sublime authority, as also their all-powerful-influence, which always tended to maintain traditional usages, rights, or customary observances, and was the chastiser of the *unwarrantable acts* of their Kings and the Ministers of State.

The aforesaid Representative at Calicut, when ordered to explain in detail the causes which tended to create civil commotions in the country in 1746, wrote as under :—" These Náyars being heads of the Calicut people, resemble the Parliament, and do not obey the king's dictates in all things, but chastise his ministers, when they do *unwarrantable acts*." (Tellicherry Factory Diary of 28th May 1746). While Mr. Logan, of the Madras Civil Service says, ' The Parliament referred to must have been the "*kottam*" or assembly of the *nád*. The *kottam* answered many purposes, when combined action on the part of the Community was necessary. The Náyars assembled in their *kottams*, whenever hunting, or war, or arbitration, or what not, was in hand. And this organization does not seem to have been confined to Malabar; for,

the *kottam* organization of the people of South-Canara gave the British officers much trouble in 1832-33. In so far as Malabar itself was concerned, the system seems to have remained in an efficient state down to the time of the British occupation (1792, 18th March), and the power of the Rajas was strictly limited." (Malabar Gazetteer. Vol. I. p. 132. 1887).

But, the *Self-Government* of the Hindus, or the administration of the country by the people themselves, does not appear to have been restricted to the Province of Malabar or the Western Coast alone. For, even the districts of the Eastern Coast of the Indian Peninsula seem to have had *Village-Republics*, and as such, enjoyed immense power and Local *Self-Government*. Because, even Mr. Logan writes that, "The Nâyar inhabitants of a *tara* formed a small republic, represented by their *karanavars* or Elders, and presented in that respect a striking resemblance to the "Village Republic" of the East-Coast-districts, as sketched by the Board of Revenue." (Malabar Gazetteer. vol. I. p 88. 1887).

Thus, it will have been perceived, that the East knew very well what *Self-Government* was, for a considerably long period, before the West had at all become aware of the same, and had perhaps, even then, owing to the latter's con-

stant communication with the former, borrowed the principles of the much coveted *Self-Governing-Institutions* from the East, which the West now so much despises. And above all, our Hindu Community especially, as also our *Village Elders* and Heads, Chiefs and Potentates, Kings and Emperors, had not only full knowledge of, and were vastly acquainted with, the art of *Self-Government*, but were immensely familiar with the secret of organising schemes for *Self-Government* and sound administration of extensive territories and stupendous Empires. (vide ante pp 154 @ 188, and 22, 23, 33-37, infra pp. 197,198,199).

Before concluding, I think it necessary to state the manner in which justice was administered in our country, as that forms an important part of our mode of *Self-Government*. And I may here mention, that in this Department, nothing was done in a high handed way. On the contrary, scrupulous care was ever taken in the direction of administration of justice. For, even from the remote times of Manu, the Law-giver of the Hindus—who flourished about 1,200 B. C., according to Sir William Jones,¹ or at any

1. (a) 'Schlegel also was confident that the date of Manu could not be later than 1,000 B. C.' (Vide Hunter's Indian Empire. Second Ed. p 114).

(b) Elphinstone thinks the date of Manu to be 900 B. C. (vide His History of India. Second Edition. Vol I. p 438).

rate from the period of the Mânava Dharma Shâstra, it was not only the King, or the Judge alone, that was to administer justice. But, it was incumbent on him, always to consult three Jurors or Assessors, when engaged in hearing any case and delivering judgment, as these used to sit with him in the Court of Justice. For, says Manu thus:—

व्यवहारान्दिदृक्षुस्तु ब्राह्मणैः सह पार्थिवः ।
मंत्रज्ञैर्मन्त्रिभिश्चैव विनीतः प्रविशेत्सभाम् ॥ १ ॥
(मनुस्मृतिः अ० ८).

सोऽस्य कार्याणि संपश्येत्सभ्यैरेव त्रिभिर्वृतः ।
समामेव प्रविश्याग्न्यामासीनः स्थित एव वा ॥१०॥
(म० स्मृ० अ० ८).

Alluding, therefore, to this very ancient *Jury-System* of ours, Lord Elphinstone, the historian of India, writes that, "Justic is to be administered by the King in person, assisted by Brâhmans and other counsellors ; or that function may be deputed to one Brâhmin, aided by three *assessors* of the same class." (History of India. p 49, volume I. Second Edition).

Thus, it will be perceived, that the *Jury* or the *Panchâyat System* prevailed in India, so far back as the times of the Code of Manu, or rather the Mânava Dharma Shâstra ; and the traditions having continued for genera-

tions without interruption, the idea has been ingrained in the Hindu Society. Nay, it naturally became crystalized in time. Accordingly, our *Village Assemblies*, even of the period of the Chola Kings and Emperors, A. D. 907-1318, having become accustomed to the Panchâyat-System from their forefathers, used to administer justice, by means of a Judge and the Jury, much in the same way as the Jury-System of the West, which came into being in England, only after the Norman conquest of the country in 1066 A. D.; although, even after this time, much was found wanting, and "what was wanting was to mould the procedure into shape." But, even this too, "it did not attain, until a century after the conquest." (*Vide* Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol XIII. p 784). In this respect, therefore, our ancient Ind was *immeasurably in advance of the West*, and even of England which boasted, that the jury-system was the birth-right of the people of that country only. This however, seems to have been owing to the fact, that they had no knowledge of the older institutions of this our hoary land of very ancient civilization. (*Vide* infra pp. 197 @ 200).

In view, however, of giving no room for entertaining the least shadow of doubt as regards the truth of the aforesaid facts, I venture to quote from an Article in the Madras Review

of 1903, No. 31, from the pen of no less a scholar than Mr. S. Krishnaswami Iyengar, M. A., on the Chola Administration (907-1318 A. D.). Says he, "In the administration of justice, the village assembly exercised equal power, if not even more. We have a few inscriptions in which such exercise of power is clearly on record. * * * * * It is not out of place here to remark that the jury system which is believed to be the special birth-right of Englishmen, and spoken of generally as unknown to India, is found to have been in full swing," during the period of the Chola Emperors (907-1318). "The Governor, it was, that took cognizance of the case first; but he did not find himself competent to proceed without the assembly." While in some cases, "the assembly proceeded without even reference to the Governor." p. 347. (*vide* also Ancient India. By the same scholar. p. 168, Edition 1911).

Again, in respect of this, Vincent A. Smith writes as follows:—"The village assemblies possessed considerable administrative and judicial powers, exercised under the supervision of the Crown officials." (The Early History of India. p. 414. Edition 1908).

In the light of these facts, therefore, (ante pp 22 @ 27, 33, 34, and Chapters iii @ ix), the idea suggests itself that, having had

due regard to the uninterrupted communication that existed between the Continent of India and Europe, even in olden times, the West had probably borrowed the principles of *Self-Government* and the Jury-System from India, and palmed them off as its own, after making requisite changes therein, as best suited the varied conditions and circumstances of Europe. I may here make a note with advantage, that an elaborate discussion appears, in respect of the origin of the jury system, in Forsyth's *Trial by Jury* published in 1852, Stubb's *Constitutional History Vol. I*, Freeman's *Norman Conquest*, Vol. V, &c. But, the views held there, seem to be only one sided, as, in all probability, these writers had not before them the past records of the Institution of the Jury-system in India, nor even that invaluable Book, the Code of Manu, otherwise called *the Institutes of Manu*, which, in the words of Meadows Taylor, "treats, in the fullest manner, of the religious and social polity of the Hindoos, as they existed 1,300 years before our Lord appeared on earth—that is, more than 3,000 years ago—and to a great extent still continue. From that book alone can a true perception of the foundation of the Hindu system be gained. In it are laws for diplomacy; for princes and their people; for priests and soldiers; for professional persons, tradesmen, and artisans, even to the lowest

degree." (Manual of Indian History. New Edition. p 20).

Moreover, in respect of the great antiquity of our Jurisprudence, as also of the influence and the immense weight of authority of the Code of Manu, even John. D. Mayne, the well-known Jurist, says as under:—

"Hindu Law has *the oldest pedigree* of any known system of jurisprudence, and *even now*, it shows no signs of decrepitude. At this day, it governs races of men, extending from Cashmere to Cape Camorin, who agree in nothing else except their *submission*."¹ (John. D. Mayne, "On Hindu Law and Usage." Preface. First Edition. 1876, p. ix).

The fact, therefore, that we have not in the least exaggerated the statement made in respect of the Institution of the *jury-system* having been *borrowed* by Europe from India, or say Asia, will be seen from the statement made by some scholars of the West, of acknowledged merit and ability, as they say that, "it (the jury-system) came from Asia through the Crusades." (*vide* Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. XIII. p 784. Ninth Edition). The Hindoos, at any rate, it may be pleaded, *never borrowed* the jury-system from foreigners.

¹ The Italics, in the above quotation, are mine. (The Author).

Thus, it will have been clearly preceived from the foregoing chapters, that the Hindus knew *Self-Government* very well. Nay, they were once the masters of the art and science of *Self-Government*. They have been a nation immensely civilised and far advanced, and certainly not *barbarous*, as some Westerners, not to say the majority of them, usually suppose, and would have us so believe (*supra pp.* 3 @ 7, 39, 40, *infra p.* 201). For such of the class, therefore, as deprecate every thing Hindu, or have a tendency to show contempt for all that is Asiatic, I beg to give an extract from Meadows Taylor's History of India, hoping that it will soften the feeling of scorn, and tend to improve the relations between the East and the West.

Says he, " The people of India are not, as many may have thought, rude or uncivilised. * * * The classes described, for the regulation of which the laws are made (by Manu—the Law-giver), must all have existed ; and thence the conclusion is irresistible, that the Hindoo people formed civilised communities which time and progress elsewhere, have very little altered. When it is considered what Europe was 3,000 years ago, and how few populations there were then on the earth, who were civilised in any material degree, it is impossible to repress a feel-

ing of respect for those who, at that remote period, maintained so high a standard, and transmitted it to their posterity." (History of India. New Edition. p. 20).

Chapter X.

Public Opinion an All-Important Factor in Ind.

It has been the hobby of some Westerners to trumpet to the world, that the Orientals never knew what *Public Opinion* was; that they were never aware that it was but a power of unique value and inestimable worth; that it was the Occidentals that could utilise it to purpose or advantage; and that it was only the Occident that imported or introduced the idea of Public Opinion into the Orient. Perhaps, the oft-repeated, not to say the stale burden of the Occidental song has been, that *Public Opinion* in the East, as seems obvious from the contempt with which it has, generally, been treated, found no place in the Orient and the Eastern Polity.¹

Besides, some of the most erudite and even well-informed persons of Europe appear to think

1. This has evidently been borne out by the way, in which the whole public opinion of Ind was treated with contempt, not only by the Government of India, in the case of the partition of Bengal, but also by the Secretary of State for India—Lord Morley—, in declaring it as "*a settled fact.*" Happily, however, the *settled fact* was *unsettled* by the gracious Durbar-boon, that emanated from the kindly and gracious intervention of the noble and generous Viceroy Lord Hardinge and His most Excellent Majesty the King-Emperor George V, on the ever memorable occasion of the Coronation Day at Delhi, on the 12th of December 1911.

very contemptuously of Public opinion and the Press in India, under the impression that the former is never the real sentiment of the people, but is an artificial cry of a microscopic minority, or the manufactured clamour of some interested few. For instance, Lord Macaulay speaks of them thus:—"We hear much about public opinion, the love of liberty, the influence of the Press. But, we must remember that public opinion means the opinion of five hundred persons who have no interest, feeling, or taste in common with the fifty millions among whom they live".....(*Vide The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay. By his nephew, the Right Honourable Sir George Otto Trevelyan. Bart. M. P. Popular Edition. 1893. p 287, supra p 7*).

This, however, is a delusion, not to say an altogether erroneous supposition; and based as it has been upon utter ignorance of facts and false belief, for which there is neither the slightest foundation nor an iota of evidence, it ever betrays a frame of mind that only indulges in inveterate bias, deep conceit, and self-interest, which overstep due limits, and at times know no bounds. But, facts are facts, and respectful attention must always be paid to them, in as much as, they exhibit phenomena which sometimes are least expected, and of which no idea whatever could ever be formed, owing to

ignorance and intense prejudice. For this purpose, it obviously seems necessary to explore the depths of our Vedic mines, as also of Sanskrit or even our modern literature, and bring to the surface the most precious and hidden treasures therefrom.

Now, going back to older times and the hoary past of the Rig-Veda, we find public Opinion *a living entity*, and by far the greatest weight seems to have been attached to it. But, apart from the fact, that much respect was shown to public Opinion, *unanimous Opinion* was held in still greater esteem, during the Rig-Vedic period and even in subsequent times, while concerted action was considered as a source of enormous strength. For, there is strong testimony in support of the fact ; and this is not only traditional and hearsay, but direct and documentary, nay, the most *ancient*, and yet the most *reliable* in the whole world, as we shall presently show.

And first and foremost is the Rig-Vedic period. Beginning, therefore, with the Rig-Vedic polity, we find preponderance always given to *public Opinion*. Nay, this was naturally considered to be an important factor in our polity as also in our social affairs ; and as it was of great moment, it invariably carried the day. In fact, the voice of the people always

predominated ; and as *public opinion* had the controlling *influence*, it was never, in the least, allowed to be stifled. Besides, in all matters affecting public weal, *people's voice* and the *opinion of the nation* had to be strictly paid due attention to; and even such an all important and most solemn function as *the election of the king*, was executed, as a matter of course, by, and with the *consent* of, the people.

Thus, we find the sentiments of our nation, that belonged to the Tertiary¹ Period, freely expressed in the Rig-Veda, as follows:—"I have *chosen* thee" (for a king) आत्वाहार्षम्.....। R. V. X. 173.1. "Let yourself (the king) be *desired* by the people." (विशस्त्वा सर्वा वाञ्छन्तु। Rig-Veda X. 173.1). And this practice of the people electing their own king obtained also

1. (a) Vide my works entitled (1) "*The Vedic Fathers of Geology*", Chapter ii, and (2) "*The Aryāvartia Home and the Aryan Cradle in the Sapta Sindhus, or From Aryāvarta to the Arctic, and from the Cradle to the Colony*," Chapters iii and xvi, as also Chapter iv. p. 63.)

(b) In connection with our Tertiary Rig-Vedic Fore-fathers, I would also advert here to the observations made by Professor Keane, as he refers to the origin of Man in the East and his migrations thence to Europe, as also to the immensely long *Old Stone Age*, to which M. Jules Peroche assigns a period of some 300,000 years, since the beginning of the Chellian Epoch." (Vide "Man Past and Present." By A. H. Keane, F. R. G. S, Professor of Hindustani. Universal College, London. p. 9. Edition 1899).

during, and continued down to, the times of the Atharva-Veda ; as even here, the traditional usage, of the king having been *elected* by the people, seems to have been evidently sanctioned, and received fresh approval. For, says the Atharva-Veda, "*Let the people elect you for kingship*" : (त्वां विशो वृणतां राज्याय । Atharva Veda. iii. 4.2).

From this, it will be perceived that during the Vedic period, much weight was attached to public opinion, and great predominance was, in the very nature of things, given to the voice of the people. Yet, there is another thing which has greater importance, and as such cannot be lost sight of, especially for the reason that particular mention of the fact has been made in the Rig-Veda and also in the Atharva-Veda, several times, as will be seen from the following.

We have already observed, that public opinion having become an important factor, there was naturally much regard for it. But, it had yet higher esteem and value, when the same was *unanimous*, and it was then rightly deemed to be *the source* of real strength and of greater controlling influence. For instance, even in the choice of a king, his *election* by the whole nation, or by the unanimous voice of the people (विशस्त्वा सर्वा वाञ्छन्तु । R. V. X. 173.1), was the chief thing desired. But, more than

this, we come across distinct passages in the Rig-Veda, and these, beyond all doubt, show the great value that was attached to the *united thought*, to the agreement of all, and to a concerted action, in the execution of business and attainment of the desired object. Thus, one verse says, in plain words, as follows:— “Be of *unanimous voice*” (संवदध्वम्), and “let your minds be all of *one accord*” (सं वो मनांसि जानतां । R. V. X. 191.2). Another verse desires the nation “to be of *one mind*” (समानं मनः), and “to have their thoughts *united*” (सहचित्तमेषाम् । R. V. X. 191.3). A third verse gives advice “to be of *one* and the same *opinion*, as also of firm resolve” (समानीवऽआकूतिः..... । R. V. X. 191.4); and it also asks our older ancestors “to be always of one heart (समाना हृदयानि वः । R. V. X. 191.4).

Now, coming down to later times, we find the Atharva Veda reiterating these very statements of facts, preaching the same doctrine, directly advocating the views in respect of giving *due weight to public opinion*, pleading in favour of the *voice of the people*, and even justifying the policy of the *election of the king by universal suffrage*. For, there are express passages on the subject, and they appear to have a very significant bearing, as the principles enunciated in the Rig-Veda seem to have once more been proclaimed to the world, and brought to the notice of the

Public, giving thereby, as it were, a *fresh sanction* to the old traditions and usages, as also to *the will of the nation*.

For instance, the choice of a man for king-ship, his *election* by general suffrage and *public opinion*, or say the voice of the people in respect of the same, are certainly pregnant with meaning and seem to be but a counterpart of what appears in the Rig-Veda ; in as much as, the Atharva-Veda also expressly says that, “ the tribesmen i. e. the people shall elect one (thee) for the king-ship ” (त्वां विशो वृणतां राज्याय । Atharva Veda III. 4.2). All these, therefore, not only revive the memory of the past, but express approbation, and affix their ever-lasting seal, in token of fresh sanction thereto.

There is, again, one more interesting thing which has to be borne in mind, and it is this : that the idea of the importance of public opinion or the voice of the people, was ever present to the mind of our Vedic ancestors. And, such opinion or the voice of the nation was even more valued and highly cherished, when it was unanimous. Nay, it served, by all means, as the most potent factor in the affairs of the people. (*supra pp 205-207*).

Turning our attention for a while to the period of Rāmāyana, we find the force of *Public opinion* still greater ; and, as such more

regard appears to have been paid to it. For we observe even Râma,—the Emperor of India, and the king of kings, abandoning his most beloved wife Sitâ, all of a sudden, simply to appease public feeling and to show due regard for it, when he perceived that it did not favour the idea of his having received her in his bosom, even after the great fire-ordeal which she had undergone, subsequent to her abduction by Râvana and the latter's destruction by Râma.

हत्वा च रावणं संख्ये सीतामाहृत्य राघवः ।

अमर्षं पृष्टतः कृत्वा स्ववेश्म पुनरानयत् ॥ १६ ॥

कीदृशं हृदये तस्य सीतासंभोगजं सुखम् ।

अंकमारोप्य तु पुरा रावणेन बलाद् हृताम् ॥ १७ ॥

लंकामपि पुरा नीतामशोकवनिकां गताम् ।

रक्षसां वशमापन्नां कथं रामो न कुत्स्यति ॥ १८ ॥

एवं बहुविधा वाचो वदन्ति पुरवासिनः ।

नगरेषु च सर्वेषु राजञ्जनपदेषु च ॥ २० ॥

(Râmâyana. VII. 43. Nirnaya Sâgar Edition).

पौरापवादः सुमहांस्तथा जनपदस्य च ।

वर्तते मयि बीभत्सा सा मे मर्माणि कृन्तति ॥ ३ ॥

जानासि त्वं यथा सौम्य दण्डके विजने वने ।

रावणेन हृता सीता स च विध्वंसितो मया ॥ ५ ॥

तत्र मे बुद्धिरुत्पन्ना जनकस्य सुतां प्रति ।

अत्रोषितामिमां सीतामानयेयं कथं पुरीम् ॥ ६ ॥

प्रत्ययार्थं ततः सीता विवेश ज्वलनं तदा ।

प्रत्यक्षं तव सौमित्रे * * * * ॥ ७ ॥

ततो गृहीत्वा वैदेहीमयोभ्यामहमामतः ।

अयं तु मे महान्वादः शोकश्च हृदि वर्तते ॥ ११ ॥

पौरापवादः सुमहांस्तथा जनपदस्य च ।.... ॥ १२ ॥

पतत्येवाधर्माँल्लोकान्यावच्छद्वः प्रकीर्त्यते ।

अकीर्तिनिघते देवैः कीर्तिलोकेषु पूज्यते ॥ १३ ॥

कीर्त्यर्थं तु समारंभः सर्वेषां सुमहात्मनाम् ।

अप्यहं जीवितं जह्यां युष्मान्वा पुरुषर्षभाः ॥ १४ ॥

अपवादभयाद् भीतः किं पुनर्जनकात्मजाम् ।... ॥ १५ ॥

आरुह्य सीतामारोप्य विषयान्ते समुत्सृज ।

गंगायास्तु परेपारे वाल्मीकिस्तु महात्मनः ॥ १७ ॥

(Rāmāyana. VII. 45).

Thus, *Public opinion* seems to have supremely predominated, during the period of Rāmāyana, in all matters, whether social, religious, or political, and as such, even Rāma, the King-Emperor,¹ had to see which way the wind blew, and pay the greatest respect to it, notwithstanding the patent fact that Sita was most dear not only to Rāma but to the whole nation as well,

1 If the Reader thinks that I have exaggerated the fact of Rama's having been an Emperor, let me read to him an extract from Colonel Tod's history of Rajasthan, wherein he says that, Rāma was "a Potentate who led the chief dominion of India, whose father Dasharatha (described as पार्श्वेन्द्र or the King of Kings and Emperor, in the Rāmāyana II. 48. 24) drove his victorious car (Ratha) over every region (Desha), and whose intercourse with the countries beyond the Brahmaputrā is distinctly to be traced in the Rāmāyana". (Tod's Annals of Rajasthan. Vol I. p 503. Third Reprint).

and was, moreover, altogether sinless (अपापां), most dutiful (रता धर्मे), beloved (प्रिया), well-bred (सत्कुले जाता), noble (आर्या), pure (शुद्धां), and deemed holy (साध्वि) by Râma and his people within the Empire, as will be seen from the following extracts:—

कृतकृत्या हि वैदेही छायेवानुगता पतिम् ।

न जहाति रता धर्मे मेरुमर्कप्रभा यथा ॥ २४ ॥

(Râmâyana. II. 40.24).

वयं परिचरिष्यामः सीतां यूयं च राघवम् ।

इति पौरस्त्रियो भर्तृन्दुःखार्तास्तत्तद्वन्व ॥ १८ ॥

(Râmâyana. II. 41. 18)

सीतया रहितोऽहं वै न हि जीवामि लक्ष्मण ॥ ६ ॥

न हि पश्यामि वैदेहीं प्राणेभ्योऽपि गरीयसीम् ॥ २६ ॥

हा प्रियेति विचुक्रोश बहुशोवाष्पगद्गदः ॥ २९ ॥

(Râmâyana. III. 61).

हा ममार्ये क यातासि हा साध्वि वरवर्णिनि ॥ ९ ॥

(Râmâyana. III. 62).

It would not be out of place to quote here the very words, put into the mouth of Râma, the hero of the renowned Work (उत्तर रामचरित्रम्), by the great Sanskrit poet Bhavabhûti, and give, in a nut-shell, the most ennobling sentiments of the highest regard for public opinion, the immense weight attached to it, and the enormous *sacrifice made for it*, at the time. Because, Râma's expression of feeling is pregnant with deep meaning. He has, therefore, given free vent to it,

by saying thus : " For the satisfaction of *the public*, I would sacrifice affection, kindness, happiness, nay *even my very life*, viz., Jânakî; and still, all this would not afflict me in the least, *if only my people should feel contented thereby*."

स्नेहं दयां तथा सौख्यं यदि वा जानकीमपि ।

आराधनाय लोकस्य मुचतो नास्ति मे व्यथा ॥

(Uttara Râma Charitam. Act I. sc. I).

What a tremendous sacrifice this ! And that too, for the sake of the people; nay, for the sole purpose of appeasing them ; and evidently for soothing *Public opinion* !! For, we have already seen, that the popular voice was against Râma's having re-admitted Sîtâ to his embraces, after her return from Lankâ ; and although the denouncement was altogether unjustifiable, as she had remained pure, and had even vindicated her chastity by undergoing the great ordeal of fire ; yet, the scandal having spread abroad in the Empire, and made Râma uncomfortable, he had to banish her, in deference to *public opinion* and the wishes of the people.

Here then, we stand face to face with facts, which not only tell their own tale in bold relief, but give a genuine idea of the great *respect* shown to the wishes of the people, nay of the unusual homage paid to *public opinion*, and afford a true picture of the inner life, of the inward working, and of the spirit of our society,

that existed during the time of Râma, some four thousand years ¹ before.

But, more than this, the aforesaid events also indicate the state of society, in which as we see, the people were the real *masters*, and the sovereign only their *agent* or authorised person, *elected* and *appointed* for giving effect to their wishes, which, by the bye, it may be noted, were at times unjust, and apparently wrong in principle. Nevertheless, they had to be carried out without demur.

These facts, therefore, forcibly recall to our mind the utterances of Burke in the eighteenth

1 This period has not been in the least exaggerated. For, the war between Râma and Râvana had taken place before the great war of the Mahâ Bhârata, in respect of the occurrence of which, Dr. Bhandarkar says as follows:— "It thus appears that in the latter part of the sixth century (A. D.), the war, which forms the theme of the Mahâ Bhârata was considered to have taken place about four thousand years before."

(*Vide* Considerations of the date of Mahâ Bhârata, in connection with the correspondence from Col Ellis. Journal. Bombay Branch. Royal Asiatic Society. vol x. pp. 81—92).

However, the close scrutiny of the geneology of Solar kings by Col. Tod and other Western scholars, yields somewhat different results. For, Tod makes the Solar line of Ikshvâku exist some 2, 256 years before Christ, and says, "I venture to place the establishment in India Proper, of these two great races, distinctively called those of the Surya and Chandra, at about 2,256 years before the Christian era." (*Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*. Volume I. p. 34. Edition 1880).

century A. D., as they afford a very interesting and striking parallel, and beautifully depict the situation from all stand-points. In the circumstances, I venture to quote them here, for ready reference and comparison. For, on one occasion, while declaring his candid opinion, he had thus expressed himself:—

“ The people are the masters. They have only to express their wants at large and in gross. We are the expert artists ; we are the skilful workmen, to shape their desires into perfect form, and to fit the utensil to the use. They are the sufferers, they tell the symptoms of the complaint ; but we know the exact seat of the disease, and how to apply the remedy according to the rules of art. How shocking would it be to see us pervert our skill into a sinister and servile dexterity for the purpose of evading our duty, and defrauding our employers, who are natural lords, of the object of their just expectations ! ” (Burke’s Works).

Apart from this, considering that Public Opinion was the great support of the State, and also believing firmly, that it could never be considered as a thing of no consequence at all, either to individuals and the public, or to administration and government, Burke had taken another opportunity, to tersely place his views before the

people of Great Briain, as follows:—"I am not one of those who think that the people are never in the wrong. They have been so, frequently and outrageously, in other countries and in this. But I do say, that in all disputes between them and their rulers, the presumption is at least upon a par in favour of the people. Experience may perhaps justify me in going further. When popular discontents have been very prevalent, it may well be affirmed and supported, that there has been generally something found amiss in the constitution, or in the conduct of government. The people have no interest in disorder." (Thoughts on the cause of the present discontents).

Now, coming down to the times of Mahâ Bhârata, we find respect for *Public opinion* immensely waxing; and the propitiation of the people strikingly great. For instance, Vidura, the half brother of Pandu and deemed to be a man of great wisdom (महाप्रज्ञम्) and of foresight (दीर्घदर्शिनम् M. Bh. V. 33'5) even by king Dhritarâshtra, eulogises very highly that person, who endeavours to please the people by every means in his power, as they benefit him in the long run.

चक्षुषा मनसा वाचा कर्मणा च चतुर्विधम् ।

प्रसादयति यो लोकं तं लोकोऽनुप्रसीदति ॥ २६ ॥

(महाभारतः ५-३४-२६).

But, perhaps above all, we observe even Lord Shree Krishna purposely advising Arjuna to secure, by all means, the good-will of the people, and thus to create *public opinion* in his favour.

लोकसंग्रहमेवापि संपश्यन्कर्तुमर्हसि ॥

(म० भा० ६. २५-४२. श्रीमद्भगवद्गीता. ३.२०).

During the period of Manu, when the rules of the Smriti Code¹ were probably in full swing, *public opinion* was not only greatly esteemed, but propitiation of the holy and the erudite, as also of the old and the elite, was considered to be one of the duties devolved upon a King. While, propriety of conduct, decorum, refined manners, obeisance, due reverence, affability, which all seems to be comprised in the most expressive word (विनय), were thought to be but essential qualities in him (the King), for obtaining sovereignty, and even for retaining it, as in the case of Prithu, Manu, and others.

ब्राह्मणान्पर्युपासीत प्रातरुत्थाय पार्थिवः ।

त्रैविद्यवृद्धान्विदुषस्तिष्ठेत्तेषां च शासने ॥ ३७ ॥

वृद्धांश्च नित्यं सेवेत विप्रान्वेदविदः शुचान् ।

वृद्धसेवी हि सततं रक्षोभिरपि पूज्यते ॥ ३८ ॥

1. In respect of the influence and the weight of authority of the Code of Manu, I have already given an extract from John D. Mayne's work on "Hindu Law and Usage." (*Vide supra* p 199).

तेभ्यो ऽधिगच्छेद्विनयं विनीतात्मापि नित्यशः ।
 विनीतात्मा हि वृपतिर्न विनश्यति कर्हिचित् ॥३९॥
 वनस्था अपि राज्यानि विनयात्प्रतिपेदिरे ॥ ४० ॥
 वृथुस्तु विनयाद्राज्यं प्राप्तवान्मनुरेव च ।
 कुबेरश्च धनैश्वर्यं ब्राह्मण्यं चैव गाधिजः ॥ ४२ ॥

(Manu Smriti. VII. 37—42).

Along with this, the Code of Manu also cites instances of those Kings, who, on account of their misconduct, disrespect of their subject-people, and even disregard for *public opinion*, had not only to forfeit their wide dominions and extensive empire, but had even to lose their heads.

बहवो विनयान्नष्टा राजानः सपरिच्छदाः...॥४०॥

वेनो विनष्टो ऽविनयान्नहुषश्चैव पार्थिवः ।

सुदासो यवनश्चैव सुमुखो निमिरेव च ॥ ४१ ॥

(Manu Smriti. VII).

Thus, we find, that in ancient times, there was usually present, to the minds of the people of Ind, a very high esteem for *public opinion*; and such of the black sheep in the fold, as through misbehaviour and wayward conduct went out of the way, had, naturally enough, to pay the penalty for mischief done.

But, more than this, even down to the first century B. C., we find such a high personage as

king Bhartrihari,¹ bending his neck before the weight of *public opinion*, giving free expression to his views, and frankly declaring that, respect should always be paid to popular sentiment, and fear ever entertained of public censure. For, says he, in one of his well-known didactic poems, entitled the *Nitishatakam*, as follows:—

विद्यायां व्यसनं स्वयोषिति रतिर्लोकापवादाइ भयम् ।

(नीतिशतकम्)

In the seventh century of the Christian Era too, it appears that Emperor Harsha had to wait, at the time of his accession, for favourable *popular sentiment*, for the support of *public opinion*, as well as for the unanimous consent of his nobles and representatives of the people, in respect of the matter. In fact, he was ever inclined to rely for his title to the crown, upon *election* by the people and the representative nobles, rather than upon his hereditary claims. (*Vide supra pp 162, 163*).

In like manner, *public opinion* in Ind seems to have swayed the minds of the people in the

1. This, says Max Muller, is "the famous Bhartrihari, so often described as the elder brother of King Vikramāditya in the first century B. C."... p 349; stating further to say that, his "learned friend—Professor Buhler.....atill holds to the belief that the Vikrama Era, which begins 56 B. C., was really established by a King of that name who lived before the beginning of the Christian era." p 285. (*Vide India. What can it teach us ? Edition 1883*).

eighth century of the Christian era, as even the great Shankarâchârya has given free expression to the then popular feeling in the matter, by saying in pithy words, that "nothing should be done or omitted to be done, howsoever proper it might be, if it is in contravention of the wishes of the people." For, says he,

यद्यपि शुद्धं लोकविरुद्धं नो चरणीयं नो करणीयम् ।

I need hardly say that Shankarâchârya, the great commentator of the Vedanta Sûtras, belonged to the eighth Century, as he was born in 788 A. D. (Vide India. What Can it teach us ? By Max-Muller. pp 354, 360. Edition 1883).

Besides, in all our works on Polity, *public opinion*, popular sentiment, and propitiation of the people, have been supposed to be the chief end of all our actions. For, it is said in the Kâmandakiya Nitisâra that a king should, by all means in his power, ever endeavour to please his subjects and propitiate his nation:—

राज्यांगानां तु सर्वेषां राष्ट्राद् भवति संभवः ।

तस्मात्सर्वप्रयत्नेन राजा राष्ट्रं प्रसाधयेत् ॥

(का० नीतिसार. ६-३).

लोकानुग्रहमन्विच्छन् शरीरमनुपालयेत् ।

(का० नी० ६-४).

Moreover, there stands our unwritten law, never to go against the will of the nation, and

we Aryan-Indians ever bend to it our knee, in accordance with our traditions, which are very ancient, time-honoured, and certainly worthy of respect.

We might as well quote innumerable instances of the kind, in which the people of Ind have shown the highest respect for popular sentiment, which, therefore, having ever got the upper hand, was an all-important factor in our polity and national character, as it had always asserted itself, nay even carried the day. But, limited space at our disposal forbids us doing so. Under the circumstances, we shall content ourselves by making mention of only one more instance, memorable alike for deep esteem for public feeling as also for the exemplary moral courage, shown by orthodox Shástrees and Pandits of Benares, as well as by a host of other Brâhmans, not to say by even very high personages of the royal family of the Peshvas, the nobles, and the Sardârs of the Maratha Empire.

The incident, which has not only *national* interest but has also *historical importance*, is briefly this : Parashurâm Bhâu Patwardhan, one of the most prominent and esteemed of the Sirdars at the Court of the Peshwa, the Commander of his forces, a veteran warrior, and a Soldier much known to fame, had a daughter named Bayabâi. She was married into the family of the Joshis of

Bâramati, when only a child of seven or eight years of age. Owing to her misfortune, her husband died all of a sudden, within about a fortnight after the marriage, and this made Parashurâm Bhâu extremely miserable. For, it was a great calamity and a sad bereavement. In fact, it was, as it were, a bolt from the blue. Seeing, therefore, that this his eldest daughter had thus become a child-widow, he was at his wit's end, especially as he thought that all her happiness was nipped in the very bud. After sometime, however, he regained his strength of mind, and in view of securing happiness, he put the whole case of his unlucky daughter before the then celebrated Râm Shâstri, who naturally enough much felt for her, and his heart was greatly touched. He, therefore, after weighing all the *pros* and *cons*, as also the whole Shastric evidence, declared and openly gave his opinion with remarkable frankness that, having had due regard to all the considerations and facts of the case, there appeared no objection whatever to the child-widow being remarried.

This opinion, coming as it did from an orthodox Shâstri of great influence and very high esteem, much strengthened the hands of Parashurâm Bhâu. Nay, emboldened by this decision in favour of the girl, Parashurâm Bhâu even sent up the papers of the case to Benares,

and invited the opinions of all the Shastrees of that most sacred city,—the strong-hold of orthodox opinion. Surprisingly enough, the Shastrias of Benares also gave in their opinion, in favour of the re-marriage of the child-widow.

Thus, it will be perceived that, Parashurâm Bhâu had, at his back, all the force of orthodox opinion, both of Mahâ-Râshtra and the first sacred city in India. Nay, he had even the sympathy of the nation, of the rulers of the land—the Peshwas,—and of the peoples of the whole Maratha Empire.

But, all this notwithstanding, Parashurâm Bhâu abandoned at last his intention of re-marrying his widowed girl, simply because, the general *public opinion* was against such a widow re-marriage. For, it was, after mature consideration, represented to him that, it was neither safe nor advisable for him to thus offend his people and the nation, by taking a departure from the established custom.

And this very thing is sufficiently remarkable, as it shows the immense weight of *public opinion*, its fast grip and tenacity in India, and the great hold it has upon the conscience of the people of Ind.

If the reader thinks I have exaggerated facts, I venture to give here an extract from the "*Gleanings from Maratha Chronicles*," of no less

a reputed scholar than the late lamented Mr. Justice K. T. Telang, who had referred to the biography of Parashurâm Bhâu, published by Mr. B. D. Nigudkar. Now, the latter had written it after reference to many original unprinted papers, and some of these, it may here be stated, were subsequently examined critically by the late Mr. Justice M. G. Ranade, for verifying Mr. Nigudkar's account. And here, Mr. Justice Telang says as follows:—"That so venerable and eminent an authority as Râm Shâstri, a man widely respected then and since, throughout the Maratha Empire, should have lent his countenance to that contemplated departure from established usage, makes the incident still more remarkable. And it is still more remarkable of all, that the Shastris of Benares should have afforded the support of their unanimous opinion to such a departure. On the other hand, it illustrates the condition of Hindu Society in reference to such a practical departure, that even with the powerful support now indicated, and with the proofs in his hand that the current notions rested on no substantial basis, a man like Parashurâm Bhâu Patvardhan should, never the less, have found himself unable, owing to his surroundings, to take the step to which the kindly impulses of his own heart prompted him." (*Vide* "The Gleanings from the Maratha Chronicles", added at end

of *the Rise of the Maratha Power*. By the late Mr. Justice M. G. Ranade, M. A. LL. B. High-Court Judge. Bombay. pp 312, 313. Edition 1900).

From the foregoing disquisition and elucidation of facts, the Reader will have easily perceived what Public Opinion—the fountain of Self-Government, really was, and still means in India. He will, moreover, be able to see that the same is but *an indigenous plant of Ind*, and *not at all exotic*; that it has been instrumental in creating a great stream of new thought in the life of ancient and modern India; that this stream is growing in volume every day; that it has been the chief means of ushering improvements in the ancient system of our Self-Government; and that it has been feeding legitimate aspirations of the people of this great country.

Chapter XI.

The Source of the Institutions of Ind

AND

Their Lasting Effects.

To fathom Ancient Ind, all knowledge acquired in Europe or America avails nought. The study must recommence as the child learns to read ; and the harvest is too distant for lukewarm energies. Thus hath a French *Savant* declared in the most pathetic strain. Yet, how brilliant the spectacle at last presented to our view, and how rich the reward of well-sustained efforts and untiring perseverance in the search for truth !

India, in fact, as has been admitted even by prejudiced writers, possesses stupendous monuments of past grandeur, which, though formerly it had dazzled the eyes of the world by its great lustre, now seems extinguished, or at any rate largely enveloped in thick clouds of deep ignorance. But, there appear visible signs of the revival of that grandeur everywhere, whether in matters of philosophy or moral elevation, science or art, .Self-Government or Constitutional agitation, public opinion or the voice of the people, unity and fusion of discordant elements or the

idea of one Nation, not to say in every department of learning or industry. This, therefore, naturally makes us pause for a while to take stock of, and look for, the source from which all these things have emanated.

I need hardly say, that it was the Vedic Rishis,—the Brāhmans, that were the real source of all the past grandeur of Ind *par excellence*; it was they that had rendered such signal service to the sacred cause of Ind, during early ages; it was they who had the original genius in the discovery and invention of many things unknown before; it was they who had given birth to many religious, social, and political Institutions of Ind, including the Caste-system, which was not at all, as has been erroneously and ignorantly supposed by some, the out-come of any the remotest selfish motive, but was ingeniously created for the sole purpose of national good, in view of insisting upon the requisite division of labour, nay germinating thereby, and securing moreover, hereditary talents, love of literature and profession, of science and art, of skill and aptitude, &c., in the family; it is they who had done and have ever been doing so much, even at great self-sacrifice, for the spread of knowledge and imparting it to all; and it is they who, owing to enormous prejudice and deep ignorance of foreigners in respect of them, have

been the recipients¹ of showers of unjust abuses, and have had so much said to their discredit, notwithstanding "the priceless service they (the Brâhmans) rendered in the earlier periods of Indian history to the cause of Indian nationality," as has been but frankly admitted by Sir Narayanrao² G. Chandavarkar, late High Court Judge, Bombay, in his recent writings and utterances.

It was the Brâhmans, he has further argued, who, during the earlier period of their 'influence proved the makers of what Sir Thomas Munro called India as one nation.....It was the Brâhman lawyers, who, dominating the Courts of kings as their Purohits, leaders, and counsellors, codified the customs, and gave them the spirit of nationality so much needed to bring the whole of India within the fold of oneness of tradition and ideal in point of religion, social coherence, and also political constitution. These had grown from the people, but the Brâhmans gave them shape and unity, and *spiritualised* all these, and held king and subject alike in the bonds of the one common faith, which to this day holds sway among the masses that both are answerable to

¹ Vide Max Muller's India. What Can it Teach Us? Edition 1883, pp. 28, 42, 43, 44, 142, 143.

² Vide his Articles headed "The Government of India, Its Evolution and Growth." The Times of India Daily. Dated 5th October 1916, p. 6.

God. By their geographical descriptions of India as one country, the land of one nation called *Jambûdwîpa*, *Bhâratavarsha*, and *Aryâ-varta*, by giving a spiritual and social unity to the different customs, and by promoting the cause of travel from one part of India to another, by their declaration of several places throughout the country as sacred, and in other diverse ways, they strengthened the germinal principle of nationality, which stood portrayed with all poetic fervour by their Aryan ancestors in the *Rig-veda*. When village was against village, and king against king, it was the Brâhmanical influence which went to create and to stir the sentiment of a common land and people throughout India,' thus immensely rendering 'the priceless service to the country,' and maintaining their supremacy.

'They (the Brahmans) ruled kings and subjects in India, and formed the consolidating and centralising power of the country in the earlier stages of India's political and social evolution.... They had been the protectors of the people as against the tyranny of Governments,.....had spiritualised India, and created the germ of nationality.'.....

I, therefore, take this opportunity to request such of the prejudiced writers and orators of the East and the West, as have been inclined to

bring reckless charges of selfishness and self-aggrandisement against Brahmans, or to throw dirt on the Brahmans for its own sake, without rhyme and reason, to remember that it is the Brahmans who, by their self-sacrifice, have been the source not only of rich and infinite Sanskrit Literature, Science, and Art (*supra pp.* 13, 14), but also of the great Political Institutions of *Vedic* and *post-Vedic Ind* (*vide* the remarks of Western Savants at the end of this Chapter). And even within historical times, we see how the Brahmans were chiefly instrumental in elevating to the throne their proteges, or creating and maintaining stupendous Empires for persons of no means, simply by their dint of energy, force of character, solid advice, and effective instructions.

For instance, it was Chânakya—the Brahman, who, while himself living as an anchorite under *the roof of straws*, and deeming, owing to his self-sacrifice and self-restraint, all the riches of the world and power as but *dust*, had raised Maurya Chandragupta to the throne of the Magadha Empire, by diplomatic skill and stratagem *par excellence*, of which, by the bye, details seem to have been embodied in the re-

nowned Treatise known as *Kautilya's Artha-shâstra*.¹ The varied precepts contained therein, appear also to have had far-reaching consequences, howsoever indirect and imperceptible, on the administration not only of Chandragupta, but also on that of his successors; of which, therefore, we shall give the requisite particulars later on, while noticing Chandragupta's career, as moulded by the diplomacy of Châṇakya.

Again Shivâji, the founder of the Maratha Empire, is another instance of the kind, in which it was only through the counsels and timely instructions of the Brâhmanas, that he was able to tide over great difficulties and achieve appreciable success which attended his *Commanding Genius* and wonderful endurance. Of the two Brâhmanas by whom Shivâji was constantly guided in all his acts and undertakings, one was Dâdoji Kondadev, who, as his *secular Teacher*,²

1 *Vide* Mysore Government Oriental Library Series. Bibliotheca Sanskrita. No. 37. Part II. Translated by R. Shâma Shâstri. B. A. M. R. A. S. 1915.

2 Some Westerners, who have neither studied nor given attention to our Literature, invidiously charge us (Brâhmanas), with having withheld our Sacred Literature from any but our own caste. It, therefore, seems necessary to give here an extract from the writings of the great Sanskrit scholar—Professor Max-Muller, to bring home conviction to the Reader that the aforesaid charge is not only groundless but utterly false. For, says the Professor: "Now, so far from withholding it (the Literature), the Brahmanas have always been striving, and often striving in vain, to make the

was very straightforward and righteous ; while, the other Râmdâs, was his *spiritual Preceptor*. The latter was a recluse and was ever devoted to God, as his essential precepts were *self-sacrifice, self-restraint, and self-culture*. Some of his instructions to Shivâji are simply priceless, as will appear from the following few extracts:—

‘The Shrines are desolate; the houses of Brâhmans are polluted; the Earth is quaking; and the faith is dead.’

‘Gods and Cows, Brâhmans and the Faith, are to be protected. This high mission to execute, hath God made *thee* his instrument.’

‘A King should gauge the capabilities of men, and should ever employ fit persons in lieu of the unfit.’.....

“*Gather the Marathas together, make religion live again; our fathers laugh at us from heaven.*”

‘The accursed barbarian has waxed mighty; be, therefore, continually on your guard against him.’

study of their sacred literature obligatory on all castes, except the Shudras, and the passages just quoted from Manu (II. 168) show what penalties were threatened, if children of the second and third castes, the Kshatriyas and Vaishyas, were not instructed in the sacred literature of the Brahmins.” (*Vide India. What Can It Teach Us ? pp 142, 143. Edition 1893*).

‘Justice and thoughtful action, Wisdom in all things and noble deeds, as also courage during hours of trial, are but the gifts of God.’

‘Fame, glory, and unexampled virtues are the gifts of God.’

‘Devotion to God, regard for Brāhmanas, protection of the people; these are the gifts of God;’
 &c &c. &c.

Here, therefore, I shall venture to make only a passing reference to the success achieved by the self-sacrificing Brāhmanas in their indefatigable and honest endeavours to do good to their nation and to mankind at large, while noticing a few of the most important and salient facts, which, in the very nature of things, are solid proofs and tangible evidences not only of *our traditional* and varied intellectual endowments in Literature, Science, and Art, but of the ineffaceable stamp of the Brāhmanic polity and its representative character, of our Constitutional Government and Public Assemblies, of our Village administration and our innate love of autonomy, of our aptitude for any up-hill work and fitness for an arduous task, of our doing things in right earnest, and of our rising equal to the occasion.

Beginning with Bimbisāra or Shrenika (B. C. 528), the fifth king of the dynasty of Shishunāga (600-371 B. C.), where we stand on historical

ground, I may here state that, he was the real founder¹ of the Magadhan imperial power, which had gradually waxed during the sovereignty of the Maurya Emperors, and which moreover was at its height in the reign of the great Emperor Ashoka. Of the Emperors of Maurya dynasty (322-184, B.C.), that came after the pusillanimous Nanda kings (371-322 B. C.), who, by the bye, had succeeded the line of Shishunāga (600-371 B. C.), Chandragupta had owed his elevation to the throne, to the Brāhman Chāṇakya, of whom, however, we shall give the requisite details later on. Of his innumerable noteworthy deeds, one thing is clear, beyond all manner of doubt, that Chandragupta had won and maintained an extensive Empire, guided as he was by the precepts of Chāṇakya. As such, therefore, his prowess and capability, his administrative talents and masterful rule, his tact and vigilance, have all been appreciated by Western writers. For instance, the great researcher and historian Vincent Smith makes the following statement in respect of the Emperor Chandragupta:—....“The hosts of Chandragupta were too strong for the (Grecian) invader, and Seleukos was obliged to retire and conclude a humiliating peace.” (The Early History of India, Edition 1908, p. 117.)

¹ The Early History of India, By Vincent A. Smith. Second Edition. 1908. p. 28.

He was, moreover, compelled to abandon all thought of conquest in India, and surrender Ariana to the west of the Indus, the satrapies of Paropanisadai, Aria, and Arachosia, along with their respective capital cities now known as Kábul, Herat, and Kândahar, including the satrapy of Gedrocia also. To crown the whole, Seleukos gave his daughter to Chandragupta, and ratified the peace by a solemn matrimonial alliance (303 B. c.). In this way, "The range of the Hindu Kush mountains", says Vincent Smith, "known to the Greeks as the Paropanisos or Indian Caucasus,... became the frontier between Chandragupta's provinces of Herát and Kábul on the south, and the Seluekidan province of Bactria on the north. The first Indian Emperor, more than two thousand years ago, thus entered into possession of that 'Scientific Frontier', sighed for in vain by his English successors, and never held in its entirety even by the Mogal monarchs of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries." p 118.

Obviously, such was the statesmanship and commanding military genius of Chandragupta ; such the acumen and keen penetration of a born Kshatriya¹ ; and such indeed the dash, not to say

1 Vincent Smith admits the fact that, " he (Chandragupta) was on the father's side a scion of the royal house of Magadha. (The Early History of India. Edition 1908. p. 115).

an awe-inspiring heroism, of one who was an Indo-Aryan and a Dvija (द्विज), initiated into the administrative skill by a Brâhman named Chânakya (चाणक्य). Admittedly, he, with his crippled resources and the supposed ignorance of the East, his limited means and the imagined *uncivilized* state of Ind, was yet more than a match for the *civilized* West. Because, he—the child of renowned Ind—, was able to achieve and had, over two thousand years before, actually made an accomplished fact, that which even enlightened England could not do in her highly advanced state of modern civilization of the Nineteenth and the Twentieth centuries, although equipped with all the aid of up-to-date science and art, such boundless wealth and exhaustless resources as wish could claim, nay, imperial power and high diplomacy, the great army and the inconceivable tactics of the “forward policy”, under proper direction and approved guidance of experienced statesmen and well trained military skill. Probably, it was owing to all these reasons that England sighed for the scientific frontier, and sighed for in vain, as tersely expressed by historian Vincent Smith (*Vide supra p 234*). -

Be that as it may, Chandragupta, after securing the North-Western frontier, had taken every opportunity to drive the foreigners and the Macedonian troops away from India, after

having completely repulsed and humbled Seleukos Nikator, or the Conqueror as he was called. Chandragupta had thus established himself as the undisputed master and Lord paramount of Northern India and the greater part of Ariana, by subjugating these with his irresistible force. In the circumstances, Vincent Smith has had to admit the fact and write as follows:—"He (Chandragupta) was undoubtedly the paramount power in India." (*p* 39)....."All the Northern States, probably as far as the Narbada, or even farther, were overrun and subjugated; so that the dominions of Chandragupta, the first historical paramount sovereign or Emperor in India, extended from the Bay of Bengal to the Arabian Sea." (*p* 116). "These achievements fairly entitle him to rank among the greatest and most successful kings known to history." (*p* 118). *Vide* The Early History of India. Second edition. 1908.

In view of further bringing home to the Reader, the Hindu capacity and extreme vigilance in the government of every department of State, howsoever small or great, where personal attention of the Sovereign was required, in deference to the will of the nation, I would here take the liberty to note down in passing the most important features of administration of the vast Empire of Chandragupta, who had apparently

conducted it on the principles laid down by Chāṇakya—his Brāhman minister, in the Sanskrit Treatise known as Kautilya's *Arthashāstra*, of which we shall take notice later on.

The first and the foremost was the Army.¹ This, to say the least, was extremely well organised, and had attained a high degree of efficiency. Chandragupta had raised the number of his infantry to 600,000, of cavalry to 30,000, and of elephants to 9,000 ; and the whole was enrolled as the permanent establishment, which also included ship-builders and armour-makers, under the control of the War-Office in co-operation with the Admiralty. All these were regularly and liberally paid. (*Vide* Diodorus ii. 41 ; Pliny VI. 19 ; Plutarch. *Alex.*)

It seems also necessary here to observe, that as Chandragupta's army was recruited from the fighting castes of India, and as it was but a

1 (a) In respect of this as also of the other Administrative Machinery, Chāṇakya's instructions seem to have been followed in the main. See please Kautilya's *Arthashāstra*, translated into English in 1915, by Mr. R. Shāma shāstry, B. A., M. R. A. S., now Acting Principal, Chāma Rajendra Sanskrit College, Bangalore.

(b) As to movements, fitness, and strength of the Army, including Cavalry, Infantry, Chariots, &c, see *Kautilya's Arthashāstra*, Book II, Chapter 30, pp 164-169 ; Bk II, Ch 33, pp 175, 176 ; Bk vi, Ch 1, pp 319-321 ; Bk. x, Ch 3, pp 443, 444 ; Bk. x. Ch 5, pp 447-449.

professional force, the agriculturists were exempt from military service. This having been the most noteworthy feature of the Emperor's Government, it naturally attracted the attention of Megasthenes, who was the Greek ambassador at his court. He has, therefore, remarked with great surprise and even with admiration, that the agriculturists could pursue their calling in peace, when the soldiers and the army of hostile kings were engaged in the battlefield. [Strabo XV. 40; Megasthenes (Mc. Crindle) Fragment I].

The system of Civil Administration of Chandragupta's Empire was likewise very efficient, and partook of the nature of Self-Government. There were Municipal Boards for large towns like Pâtaliputra, the capital of the Empire. The duties of these Boards were different and multifarious, of which the particulars have already been given above (supra pp 159,160). There is, however, one more important point which cannot be ignored, and which, therefore, must be stated here in brief. Of the several Municipal Boards, referred to before, one had the charge of the registration of births and deaths, among both high and low. In respect, therefore, of these vital statistics, Vincent Smith's remarks deserve notice. Says he, "Nothing in the legislation of Chandragupta is more astonishing to the observer,.....than this

registration of births and deaths.....And it is impossible to imagine an old fashioned Râja feeling anxious 'that birth and deaths among both high and low might not be concealed. Even the Anglo-Indian, administration, with its complex organization and European notions of the value of statistical information, did not attempt the collection of vital statistics until very recent times, and always has experienced great difficulty in securing reasonable accuracy in the figures." (The Early History of India. Second Edition. 1908. p 126.)

The administration of distant provinces was carried on by, and entrusted to Viceroys, who were generally the members of royal family. This appears to indicate that care was ever taken to train the princes, nay initiate them from their youth into the art and science of Government, make them learn human nature with all its shades of thought and diversity of character, and be always practical, as men of business, in their affairs and the government of the Empire.

There was again the Intelligence Département, (*Vide Kautilyâs Arthashâstra*. Bk xii, Ch. iv. pp 468, 469), and Arrian's informants assured him that the reports sent in were always true, and that no Indian could be accused of lying... It is certainly the fact that the people of ancient India enjoyed a widespread and enviable repu-

tation for straightforwardness and honesty. (Vide Vincent Smith's *Early History of India*. Edition 1908. p 128 ; Max Muller's *India. What Can it Teach us ?* Edition 1883. pp 38 @ 75—The Truthful character of the Hindus). Megasthenes also has described the general honesty of the people and the efficient administration of the criminal law, as he had but the rare opportunities of seeing personally everything on the spot, during his stay as the Greek Ambassador at the Court of Emperor Chandragupta. Crime was generally less, and the extraordinary spectacle of "No crime," in ancient Ind, had, in the very nature of things, forced itself on the attention of the West; which fact, therefore, we have noticed before. (Supra p. 156). "Theft", says Megasthenes, "is of very rare occurrence....They (Indians).....confide in each other. Their houses and property they generally leave unguarded. These things indicate that they possess good, sober sense" (Fragment xxvii). This is confirmed by Hiuen Tsiang, a thousand years after Megasthenes [*vide* Hiuen Tsiang's *Travels*. *Buddhist Records* (Beal). Bk. II.]

As to *Irrigation*, which is of the first importance on account of the uncertainty in the fall of rain in India, it seems that there was a regular system of canals; and every possible care was taken to look to the needs of agriculturists, even

in the remotest provinces of the Empire of Chandragupta. In fact, a special Irrigation Department was created for the purpose, and entrusted with the duty of measuring lands for levying water-rates, according to the supply of water from the canals. This, therefore, throws immense credit on the vigilance and care, foresight and statesmanship of Chandragupta. (Mc Crindle. Fragment XXXIV ; Strabo. XV. 1. 50). These beneficent canal works, constructed, from time to time, under the great patronage of the Maurya Emperors, had endured for over four hundred years, till the cyclone of exceptional violence in 150 A. D., destroyed the Sudarshana¹ Lake along with its embankments, as also the channels and the canals that had received water from "*the beautiful*" great reservoir.

Moreover, roads were made and properly maintained under orders of the Emperor ; and pillars that served as mile-stones were set up at intervals of half a *kos* or say a mile, for the convenience of travellers. In short, not only was all possible care taken for the comfort of the needy and the indigent, the rich and the poor, but every effort was made and no stone was left unturned, to ameliorate the condition of the helpless, and to augment the happiness of the

1 In respect of the site of this lake, see Mr. Cousins, Progress Report (*Archæ-Survey* W. I. vol. ii. 1898-9, para 49).

people within the Empire. (*Kautilya's-Arthashastra*. Book I. Chapter 1. pp 52, 53, 54).

Having had, therefore, due regard to all these facts, Vincent Smith has justly observed that, "The foregoing review of the civil and military system of Government during the reign of Chandragupta, proves clearly that Northern India in the time of Alexander the Great *had attained to a high degree of civilization, which must have been the product of evolution continued through many centuries.*" (*Vide The Early History of India*. Edition 1908. p 132. The Italics in the Extract are mine. *The Author.*).

Bindusâra, the son and successor of Chandragupta (298-273 B. C.), had, like his father, continued the work of annexation, and even effected the conquest of the Deccan, down to the latitude of Madras. The works of Irrigation and those intended for the comforts of the people, were also in progress, during his reign of twenty-five years, and there was profound peace within the Empire. There is every reason to believe that Chânakya's precepts had immensely influenced the administration of Bindusâra as also of his renowned son Ashoka, in the difficult task of maintaining the Empire.

Ashoka (273-232 B. C.), who succeeded his father, was the most illustrious of the Maurya Emperors. It is not necessary to enter here into

the details of the conquests, the achievements, and the works of peace of this great sovereign, as history has recorded them in full. Suffice it to say, that his strong, effective, and beneficent rule had ensured peace and security throughout the Empire. He, therefore, in the words of Vincent Smith "rightfully claims a place in the front rank of the great monarchs, not only of India, but of the world." (Early History of India. Second Edition. 1908. p 140).

No brighter star of the Maurya dynasty ever shone after Emperor Ashoka, and the line was extinct in 184 B. C. At this stage, therefore, it would be just, to notice, in brief, the highest diplomacy and marvellous power of organisation of the great Brāhmana Chānakya, the master-statesman and the astute politician, the Empire-builder and the King-maker, one that had raised the Maurya Chandragupta to sovereignty¹ and was the inveterate foe of the Nandas, the self-made man and the greatest Indian exponent of the Art and the Science of Government. As such, therefore, he had exercised unbounded influence over Emperor Chandragupta Maurya. This we see typically depicted in the *Mudrā Rākshasa*, where the Emperor is describ-

1 (a) In the *Mudrā Rākshasa* of Vishākhadatta, the following words are put into the mouth of Chānakya:—"Where is this babbling wretch, that idly threatens the monarch, I have raised." (Act i. Sc. 1). And later on

ed as one who finds himself perfectly helpless without the guidance of his most capable Brâhmana minister Chânakya. For him, accordingly, the Emperor had such deep regard that the latter, whenever the two meet, greets the former by touching his feet. Moreover, when the Emperor is seated on the throne, he, while greeting, actually *descends and falls at Chânakya's feet*, while the latter addresses the Emperor thus. "Arise, my son,.....Vrishala"..... (Vide *Mudrâ Râkshasa*. Act iii. Scene 2).

The extraordinary influence possessed by Chânakya was obviously due to the self-less spirit in which he had worked and given re-

again, he says, ".....I hurled Nanda, from his throne,"— (Act iii Sc 2).

(b) We also learn from the *Kathâsaritsâgara*, that Chandragupta Maurya obtained his throne through the favour of Vishnugupta, otherwise called Kautilya, or the patronymic Chânakya.

(c) The *Vâyu Purâna* writes to the same effect :—

चन्द्रगुप्तराज्ये कौटिल्यः स्थापयिष्यति ।

(d) The *Matsya* and *Brahmânda Purânas* are almost unanimous in their statement of this nature, viz. उज्जरिष्यति-तान्सर्वान्कौटिल्यः । While, *Matsya Purâna* further adds: कौटिल्यश्चन्द्रगुप्तं ततो राज्येऽभिषेदयति ।

(e) The *Mahâvamsa* says: "Then did the Brâhmana-Chânakka, anoint a glorious youth, known by name Chandra. gupta, as king over all Jambudwîpa, born of a noble clan, the Moriyas, when filled with bitter hate, he had slain the ninth (Nanda) Dhanananda. (Vide Gieger's *Mahâvamsa*, Ch. V).

quisite instructions to Chandragupta, for the Government of his vast Empire, in all its branches of administration. It will, therefore, not be out of place to notice here, in brief, Chanakya's wonderful devotion to duty, his immense self-sacrifice for the emancipation of his country and freedom of India, his untiring energy, his sterling merits as a practical statesman deeply read in the Science of Government, his unflinching honesty, his unquestionable integrity, and his inestimable disinterestedness. All these qualities have been fully appreciated and faithfully portrayed in the *Mudrâ-Rākshasa*. While, Chânakya's unostentatious manners, as also his extremely simple mode of living, are beyond all praise, and appear in no way to have been exaggerated. When, therefore, Vaihinara, the attendant of Chandragupta, saw the miserably thatched roof and the ill-furnished hut of Chânakya, in contrast with the sumptuous, magnificent, and well-furnished mansions of ministers, he was naturally struck with the sight, and observed thus :—... 'Here is a bit of stone for bruising cowdung fuel. There is a bundle of holy grass (*Kusha*), collected by the disciples. While, the old walls from which a thatched roof projects, are covered by a parcel of fuel stuck up to dry. Chandragupta merits such a minister. Those who have no wants are only freemen, and to them a monarch is no more than a whisp of straw.' (*Vide Mudrâ Rākshasa. Act III. Sc. 2*).

It will, moreover, be specially interesting to take cognizance of the instructions in diplomacy given by Chânakya as preceptor¹ (गुरुः) to his royal disciple¹ (शिष्यः) Chandragupta—the Emperor, since we cannot help admiring the great talents of the *self-sacrificing* Brahman-Minister, his penetrating political foresight, his wonderful sagacity, the series of his Machiavelian strata-gems, his diplomatic skill and practical tactics, displayed during his endeavours to secure the desired end, and finally his self-lessness in the desire to have achieved the chief object of his ambition. It will, therefore, not be out of place to examine here a few of the salient features and prominent characteristics of Chânakya's polity, from the stand-point of *Self-Government* that had prevailed in ancient Ind.

Now, our hoary Fore-fathers had divided the various branches of knowledge under different heads.² Of these, however, Politics had formed one of the most important subjects for study. It, therefore, very naturally enough, has been engaging our attention from the remotest times. We have already noticed what our Vedic Fore-fathers had achieved in the matter (*vide supra* Chapters II and III). While our great Epic—the

1. *Vide* Mudrâ Râkshasa (Act III. Scene 1).

2. *Vide* Mahâ-Bhârata, Chânakya's Arthashâstra, Kâmandaki, Shukranîti, Brîhaspati, Ushana, &c.

Mahā-Bhārata has, in the Shānti-Parva, emphatically declared that, "whenever the Science of Politics is neglected, the three Vedas together with all virtues decay." Again, it further says that, "Rāja-Dharma" or Politics is the very head and front of the duties of Man."

Moreover, the School of Ushanas may be said to hold the view that, 'there is only one Science, and this is the Science of Government.' For, it is urged by this School that, 'it is in this Science that all other sciences have their origin and end'. Chānakya, on the other hand, defines Politics as the Science which treats of expedient and inexpedient actions (नयानयो), or of prudent and imprudent policy, as also of Nation's strength and weakness (बलाऽबले), in the conduct of Government and practical administration.

Thus, we see that Chānakya was a practical statesman of very high merits, and he was second to none among the numerous and capable diplomatists of his times. His work on Polity

1. मज्जेत्तयि वण्डीनीती हताया । सर्वे धर्माः प्रक्षयेयुर्विरुद्धाः ॥
सर्वधर्माश्चाश्रमाणां हताः स्युः । क्षात्रे नष्टे राजधर्मे पुराणे ॥ २८ ॥
2. सर्वे भोगा राजधर्मेषु दृष्टाः । सर्वादीक्षा राजधर्मेषु चोक्ताः ॥
सर्वा विद्या राजधर्मेषु युक्ताः । सर्वे लोकाराजधर्मे प्रविष्टाः ॥ २९ ॥
सर्वे धर्मा राजधर्मेषु दृष्टाः । सर्वे भोगा राजधर्मेषु राजन् ॥
सर्वे योगा राजधर्मेषु चोक्ताः । सर्वे धर्मा राजधर्मे प्रविष्टाः ॥
तस्माद्धर्मो राजधर्माद्विशिष्टो । नान्यो लोके विद्यतेऽज्ञातशत्रो ॥ ३० ॥

(Mahā-Bhārata. The South Indian Texts Edition, 1908. XII. 62. 28, 29, 30.).

has been well known as *Kautilya's Arthashastra* ; and this has treated in detail of the Art and Science of Government, of the duties of Kings and ministers, of the creation and appointment of counsellors, of the construction of forts and protection of trade, of the elements of sovereignty and other innumerable questions affecting the stability of government, policy of the State, recruitment of the army, maintenance of¹ peace tactics, manœuvres, strategies, &c, &c.

Yet, more than this, we further observe that in his work, Chānakya, the master-statesman, has laid great stress on the King's acting up to, or carrying into effect, *the will of the Nation*, rightly thinking that the people are the real masters. This certainly deserves to be noticed by all, and especially by the prejudiced mind of the West, as it has been labouring under the mistaken notion and false impression, that the will of the Nation or Public Opinion existed nowhere in

1. Vide *Kautilya's Arthashastra*, of which the Original Text is in Sanskrit. This, however, has been translated into English by Mr. R. Shāmasāstri, B. A., M. R. A. S., Librarian, Government Oriental Library Mysore, and now Acting Principal of the Chama Rajendra Sanskrit College, Bangalore, in the Government Oriental Library Series, Bibliotheca Sanskrit. No 37. Part II. The Translation of the Work of Chānakya appears in a separate Treatise, which contains fifteen Books, each Book having separate chapters.

The English translation was published in 1915, and it is this translation and the Treatise that I have oft referred to, in my present work.

the East, before it came into close contact with the West. (*Vide supra pp 202, 203, 204*). But, this biased view of the West is more a figment, presented to the Public as a treat, than a reality, as we have already shown above (*pp 205 @ 224*). However, let us see what Chánakya, the great and acknowledged authority in politics, states in respect of obedience to the will of, and respect for the Nation. Says he, the king or the conqueror "should follow the friends and leaders of the peoples.....Whoever acts against the will of the people...will become unreliable. He should adopt the same mode of life, the same dress, the language, and customs, as those of the people. He should follow the people in their faith.....He should please them by giving gifts, remitting taxes, and providing for their security." (*Vide Kautilya's Arhashástra. Book XIII. Chapter V. pp 491, 492. Edition 1915*).

Obviously, it is on account of the invaluable merits of practical politics displayed in the treatise, that even *Savants* of advanced Europe speak of the Bráhmaṇ-Minister's work as follows :—

"I can testify to the great value of the work, which sheds more light upon the realities of ancient India, especially as concerns administration, law, trade, war, and peace, than any text which we possess, and which will enrich our

lexica with an immense accession of technical and other expressions belonging to all departments of life". (Mr E. W. Thomas, Librarian, India Office Library, London, in the April Number of 1909. J. R. A. S. p. 466).

In like manner Dr. J. Jolly, in his letter dated 23rd November 1908, to the Translator of *Kautilya's Arthashāstra*, writes thus :—

"I must say that this is one of the most interesting and valuable Sanskrit works ever procured. As a faithful and life-like representation of Indian Institutions and modes of Government, it is without a parallel. It throws a great deal of new light on Indian Constitutional history and on the development of Indian Law." Elsewhere, he adds, "A flood of light has been thrown on the political condition of India in the very times when Megasthenes visited it, by the recent discovery of the Kautilya-Arthashāstra." And as to the authenticity of this work, he says, "It can no longer be called in doubt after the learned discussion contained in a paper published in Germany by Prof. Hallebrandt of Breslau." "We consider this as one of the most important discoveries ever made in the whole range of Sanskrit Literature." (*Vide Mysore Review*. May 1909.)

While Dr. L. D. Barnett, Professor of Sanskrit, University College, London, writes to say

that The Arthashāstra "is evidently a work of the highest importance for the study of Indian history and law."...

Besides, Dr. J. F. Fleet observes that, "The Kautilya Arthashāstra...is of exceptional interest and value. In the first place, it ascribes itself in unmistakable terms to the famous Brāhmana Kautilya, also named Vishnugupta, and known from other sources by the patronymic Chanakya, who, tradition tells us, overthrew the last king of the Nanda dynasty, and placed the great Maurya Chandragupta on the throne..... The work accordingly claims to date from the period B. C. 321-296 ; and its archaic style is well in agreement with the claim. Secondly, as regards its nature and value. Kautilya is renowned, not only as a king-maker, but also for being the greatest Indian exponent of the art of government, the duties of kings, ministers, and officials, and the methods of diplomacy. That a work dealing with such matters was written by him, is testified to by various more or less early Indian writers, who have given quotations from it. But the work itself remained hidden from modern eyes, until it was found in the text of which the translation is laid before us here..... And it seems to be agreed by competent judges that, though the existing text is perhaps not absolutely word for word that

which was written by Kautilya, still we have essentially a work that he did compose in the period stated above. The value of it is unmistakable.....In short, it throws quite a flood of light on many problems in the branch of Indian studies to which it belongs."

Thus, the Reader will have easily perceived, how much of *Self-Government* and *Constitutional Monarchy*, administrative science and art of government, diplomatic skill and the cleverest conduct of foreign affairs, movements of the Army and tactics of war, policy of neutrality and the needful address required in making peace, &c., &c., has been found in the work of Chânakya, the Brâhman minister; how necessity had produced the work of the kind; how according to the needs of the times, the basis of administration was duly formed and reforms made in all its branches; how the requisite instructions were timely given to the royal pupil and Emperor Chandragupta Maurya, in the government of the country; how the Emperor had utilised these to the best advantage; how he was able thereby to make himself the master of the situation, and drive out of India the foreign garrison (*supra pp 235,236*); how his *strong hand* and *iron will* had governed the vast Empire; and last but not least, how he had done this all, for his people and the nation; nay, how he had

rescued them from foreign yoke, not to say from the intolerance of misrule, and, guided as he was by Chânakya, carried on in Northern India, the various works of peace which had reigned supreme for three generations, till the death of his grandson Ashoka.

It seems, by the bye, necessary here to remark that, it was not in Northern India alone that the precepts of Chânakya and the Brâhmanical polity were recognised, adopted, and had taken a deep root. But, these had permeated the masses even in Southern India; as we find that the principles of Brâhmanical Self-Government, or of the system of Government by the people, had prevailed here for a considerable time. For example, in the Kerala State in Southern India, there were, during the first and second centuries of the Christian Era, five assemblies as follows :—

(1) The Assembly of the People. This consisted of the representatives of the people; and these were summoned from all parts of the State, as they acted as a check upon the King.

(2) The Assembly of the Priests. This was in respect of the religious matters of the State, and corresponded to the *Vidatha* (विदथ) of the Vedic period, (supra pp 47, 48, 92).

(3) The Assembly of Physicians. This served as a Board of Public Health,

(4) The Assembly of Astrologers. This fixed auspicious times, and declared favourable or unfavourable stars.

(5) The Assembly of Ministers. The duty of this was to secure the efficiency of all Departments of the State.¹

Moreover, such Self-Government or the Government of, and carried on by, the Nation, its Assemblies, and Representatives, had existed even in Ceylon during the tenth century (900-990 A. D.), not to say earlier still, as we find that in this island, all measures were enacted by the King-in-Council, and all orders were issued by, and under the authority of, the Council. Besides, we further learn that, the Queen of the island, named Lilāvati, and also other kings, had greatly appreciated the high value of the Nation's Assembly. For, in a "Slab-Inscription" of the Queen, she has unreservedly declared her views as follows:—"By creating a Council of wise, brave, and faithful ministers, she has freed her own kingdom from the dangers (arising) from other kingdoms." (*Vide* Epigraphia Zeylanica. Vol. I Nos. 14, 21 ; Vol. II, No. 6 ; Pillar Inscription of Dappula V, Vol. II, No 8. Ep. 2).

1. *Vide* "The Polity and Social Life in Ancient Kerala." By P. S. Rāma Krishna Iyer, as also Chillapa Adikāram, and Mani-Mekalai.

In fact, our Ancestors saw things eye to eye, having been a gifted race ; while *necessity* and experience enabled them to acquire mature knowledge, when engaged in making progress. This *knowledge* served as an incentive to making search for facts and finding out first principles of truth, which in turn ensured *culture* in the varied branches of knowledge. This *culture*, in time, became *hereditary* ; and evidently, it was the salient traits of this *hereditary culture* that enabled our ancestors to hold their own against all odds and at all times, whatever the difficulties or the nature of circumstances.

For instance, the spread of Buddhism had threatened the very existence of Brâhmanic polity¹ and Brâhmanic religion. Yet, these had not only held their own, but were, moreover, powerful enough to drive Buddhism out of India,—the place of its birth, although beyond the confines of India, Buddhism still stands numerically strong, and claims less than half,² and

1. Vide Professor Rhys Davids's *Buddhist India*. Edition 1903, pp 149-152 ; and Vincent A. Smith's *Asoka*, Second Edition. 1909. pp 149, 151, 208.

2. *Buddhism*. By Dr. T. W. Rhys Davids. Edition 1890. pp 5, 6.

more than one third of the population of the Globe, as its adherents or followers.

Mahomedanism also, during its work of conversion to Islamism, and *the Sword*¹ or *Koran propaganda* thereof in India, was found too strong for, not to say even intolerable to, Hindu Religion and Government, until the far-famed Shivâji,—the *founder* of the Marâthâ Empire and the *liberator* of our country,—appeared on the scene. His was certainly an uphill work, as there was the Mahomedan domination everywhere, and he had to struggle through thick and thin, surrounded as he was by dangers, or exposed to risks, on all sides. Yet, he achieved what was absolutely a desideratum truly supposed to be beyond the reach of possibility, and secured *independence* for his country against all odds. Nay, he came to the rescue of the proverbially tolerant² Hinduism, and saved the Hindu nation from wholesale conversion to Islamism.

1. (a) Life of Mahomad. Tract and Book Society. p 172. Third Edition. 1858.

(b) Lord Elphinstone's History of India. Vol. I. p 515. Second Edition.

2. (a) The most tolerant spirit of Hinduism is proverbial ; and Dr. Sir William Hunter says for this very reason, that, "The Hindus are among the most tolerant religionists in the world." (The Indian Empire. Second Edition. p 227).

Christianity too, had, during its early period, sullied the pages of history by its proselytizing propaganda, by perpetual military aggressions, nay by occasional cold-blooded massacres,¹ by killing or persecuting even the kith and kin, simply for having belonged to a different creed²,

(b) Moreover, even of this our Hindu religion, it is said, "As to Hinduism, it is a solemn thought that at least 200 millions of our fellow subjects are adherents of that religion. And yet it is a remarkable characteristic of Hinduism that it neither requires nor attempts to make converts. Nor is it by any means at present diminishing in numbers. Nor is it at present being driven off the field, ...by being brought into contact with two such proselytizing religions as Christianity and Mahammadanism. On the contrary, it is at present rapidly increasing." (The Religion of the Hindus. By Sir M. Monier Williams. pp 433, 434, 435).

(c) Says Mrs. Annie Besant, "But,.....I regard Hinduism as the most ancient of all religions, and as containing more fully than any other, the spiritual truths." (The Daily Chronicle. 7 April 1894. Mrs. Annie Besant's View of the Hindu Religion).

(d) "Another characteristic of Hinduism is that it is all receptive, all comprehensive. It claims to be the one religion of humanity, of human nature, of the entire world.And in real fact, Hinduism has something to offer which is suited to all minds." (The Indian Magazine and Review, No. 249. September 1891).

1. Vide. Dr. Sir Wm. Hunter's Indian Empire. Second Edition. p 254, where he refers to 'religious persecutions, military aggressions, and cold blooded massacres, by the Portuguese Christians, on the southern and western coasts'.

2. Vide Dr. Sir Wm. Hunter's Indian Empire. Second Edition. pp 241, 242, 253, 254.

and by separations of the married clergy from their wives.¹ The brutal mode of action in regard to the religions of India, the attacks² on the peace-loving Hindus, and deceptive allurements³ working upon the poor and the needy, were obviously the effects of the policy of the Portuguese hostile aggrandizement; while, the cruelties⁴ of the inhuman Portuguese soldiery, or the atrocities and persecutions experienced in the evangelization of the population of whole⁵ villages, the complete conversion of the Paramars⁶ of Tennevelly, as also the baptizing of almost the entire caste containing about 20,000 souls,

1. *Vide* Dr. Sir Wm. Hunter's *Indian Empire*. Second Edition. p 242.

2. *Do.* *Do.* p 244.

3. Ward's "India and the Hindoos." Edition 1853. Preface. pp 5, 6. *Vide* also below Foot-note 6.

4. Sir Wm. Hunter's "Indian Empire." Second Edition. pp 244, 254.

5. The Imperial Gazetteer of India. New Edition. Vol. XXIII. p 368.

6. In respect of the moral value of this sort of conversion, an experienced traveller, a Chaplain, and a Missionary says as under :—" Well known it is that the Jesuits there, who, like the Pharisees, that would compass sea and land to make one proselyte (Matt. 23-25), have sent into Christendom, many large reports of their great conversions of infidels in East India. But, all these boastings are but reports; the truth is, that they have there spilt the precious water of Baptism upon some few faces, working upon the necessity of some poor men, who for want of means which they give them are contented to wear crucifixes, but for want of knowledge in the doctrine of Christianity are only in name Christians." [Voyage to East India. (*Della Valle*). pp 402, 417, 419, 480. Tod's "Annals of Rajasthan." Vol. I. p 560. Third Reprint. 1880.] *Vide* also Foot-note 3, above.

have left a deep stain on the early European enterprise in India, undertaken either in the interest of land-grabbing, or even of missionary work.

It seems, by the bye, but proper here to observe that, the early Portuguese navigators were neither traders nor private adventurers. They were evidently admirals with a Commission from the king of their country, to acquire territory by conquest, and propagate Christian religion. In A. D. 1500, Cabral was despatched to India from Portugal, by the king of the country, with thirteen ships and twelve hundred soldiers ; and he was even instructed to begin by preaching, for the spread of Christianity. Nay, he had further orders to the effect that, " in case the preaching of the Gospel failed, to proceed to the sharp determination of the sword."

But, with all this, no appreciable results were achieved. For, the Portuguese had neither the political strength nor the statesman's sagacity. Nor had they the personal character requisite either for maintaining an Empire, or for making the Gospel-mission successful. In fact, having had neither foresight nor tact, they, as knights-errant and crusaders, looked upon every pagan as an enemy of Portugal and the foe of Christ. In the circumstances, it is only those who having

1. *Vide* Hunter's "Indian Empire." Second Edition. p 366.

been conversant with the contemporary events of their conquests, can realize the ignorance, the credulity, and the atrocities, with which their history in India appears to have been tarnished.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that in the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, the Hindus, their Religion, and their Government, were placed between two grinding mill-stones and were hard pressed by the two proselytizing religions,—Mahomedanism and Christianity,—the one extending its arm from North to South, and the other trying to effectively spread its net from the South to the North of India. The guiding idea, not to say the chief principle, or rather the Mottos of both these religions, were almost identical, viz. *Koran or Sword* of the one, and *Gospel or Sword* of the other (*vide supra pp 256, 259*). While Hinduism, although on account of its proverbially *most tolerant spirit in the world*[*supra p 256 Foot-note 2 (a)*], nay owing to its towering¹ height and its moral strength, its

1 Rev. D. Machichan observes,—“The strength and influence of Hinduism are to be found in that great socio-religious organization,.....the system of caste,” “the great religious system, which dominates the land.” (Education as a Missionary Agency. A paper read by the Rev. D. Machichan. D. D. Principal, Wilson’s College, Bombay, in the Decennial Conference, held on the 2nd of January 1893.

most elevating truths in the Upanishads¹ and its sublime machinery, it had created gaeat impression, and agreeably deep surprise in the rank and file of the enemies, had yet the sword of Damocles hanging over its head, with all the anxieties and sufferings, which the patient Hindus had to endure and abide their time, or wait with longing eyes their promised² guide and the far-famed deliverer.

1 (a) Says Mrs. Annie Pesant as follows, in respect of this :—" Nothing deeper and loftier can be offered to him (the Hindu), in religious philosophy than his Vedanta."...

" In the Upanishads, lies the philosophy of India." (India's Mission in the world, Calcutta Town Hall).

(b) Lord Elphinstone remarks....." In the knowledge of the being and nature of God, they (the Hindus) were already in possession of a light, which was but faintly perceived even by the loftiest intellects, in the best days of Athens." (History of India. Vol. I. pp 94-95. Second Edition).

(c) Writes also Dr. Goldstucker thus :—" The Vedanta is the sublimest machinery set into motion by Oriental thought."

(d) While Victor Cousin declares, " When we read with attention the poetical and philosophical monuments..... of India,...we discover there so many truths, and truths so profound, and which make such a contrast with the meanness of the results at which the European genius has sometimes stopped, that we are constrained to bend the knee before that of the East, and to see in this cradle of the human race the native land of the highest philosophy."

2 (a) The History of Mysore, by Colonel Wilkes, narrates a prophecy which he had found recorded in some Hindu manuscripts of 1646 A. D., in the well known

But, inspite of all the unfavourable state of things and adverse circumstances, nay, notwithstanding the determined obstinacy of the relentless Christo-Moslem grinding mill to convert the masses, we had risen equal to the occasion; and the all-powerful and *supremely tolerant* Hinduism had held its own against all odds. For, the auspicious birth of Shivājee the Great, and his timely appearance on the stage, had heralded the *dawn* of the Marathā Empire. While, the approach on the horizon of this rising Sun of the East, was gradually diminishing the ever dismal dark that had surrounded all quarters, and was putting an end to the most dreadful groans of conversion, that had spread the gloom everywhere in the land, by

Mackenzie Collections. In one of these, the prophet, after describing "The ruin of all virtue and religion, and the humiliation which the noblest in the land had been made to suffer," concludes thus with the brightest of hopes :—" *The time for deliverance will come at last, and the virgins will announce it with songs of joy, and the skies will shower their flowers.*" (The Italics are mine. *The Author.*)

(b) In respect of this prophecy, the late lamented, the Honourable Mr. Justice M. G. Ranade also observes as follows :—"This prophecy was written in Southern India, at a time when Shivāji's name was not known beyond his *Jahagir* in Poona, but Colonel Wilkes testifies that the application of it was by universal agreement made to the deliverance which Rājā Shivāji was the instrument of effecting by his genius and his arms, before the century had far advanced." (Vide *The Rise of the Marathā Power*. Edition 1900. p 46).

securing the *independence* of the Mahrattas at each step and in every quarter, nay by making them free from all trammels, and by achieving even their *political greatness*, which for a time had certainly made them the *Sovereign-power* in India, for over a century and a quarter. As a matter of fact, Shivâjee the founder of the Maratha Empire, whose name and fame shall ever remain green in our memory, had made a successeful beginning with an exemplary foresight, leaving the task which had remained unfinished during his life-time, to be accomplished by his successors and their most capable Prime ministers—the Peshwas, who, as Brahman Rulers of the land for over a century, had not only maintained the *religious prestige* of Ind, but also the *prestige* of her *political greatness*, through the favour of the Omnipotent and the Omnipresent. For, Lord Shree Krishna, hath said:

“ *.....*.....*.....* I do create
 “ Myself whenever righteous cause decays,
 “ And when impiety’s rampant. I am born
 “ In every age the sinful to destroy,
 “ To ’stablish righteous cause,
 “ and save the good.¹ ”

(The Bhagavad Gîtâ. iv. 7, 8).

1 यदा यदा हि धर्मस्य ग्लानिर्भवति भारत ।

अभ्युत्थानमधर्मस्य तदाऽऽत्मानं सृजाम्यहम् ॥ ७ ॥

I may also state here with advantage, that, the Mahrâttas as Sovereign Rulers of the land had assiduously preserved¹ the ancient Constitution of Ind, that had prevailed in the country from time immemorial. Because, it was found to be most useful; nay, it had even budded and blossomed, and was the *source* of the Religious, Social, and Political Institutions of India. Our Religious Constitution of old (the *Vidatha*) was the prototype of the present Matha-System (मठसंस्था), established by the great Shree Shankarâchârya I, in the four different directions of India, as the convenient centres for all ; while, our Social and

परित्राणाय साधूनां विनाशाय च दुष्कृताम् ।

धर्मसंस्थापनार्थाय संभवामि युगे युगे ॥ ८ ॥

(श्रीमद्भगवद्गीता । अ० ४) .

1. While the indigenous rulers endeavoured to preserve from destruction the most valuable, not to say priceless *Self-Governing Institutions* of Ind, under foreign yoke, there was, generally speaking, no sympathy for them, and it had even "left the old village Republics to die," as admitted even by Indians and Anglo-Indians of position. "On this point," says Sir Nârâyanrao Chandâvarkar, "the testimony of Sir Thomas Munro is most valuable, because he was among those who strongly championed the cause of the old village system of administration. He says, with a sigh of sorrow, in his Minute dated the 27th of April 1821, that the Company widely departed from the usage of the country, by the disuse of the system of village Panchayats, because it had been introduced into the Madras Code of 1816, with so many restrictions as to deprive it of much of its utility. It was therefore abandoned." (The Times of India. Dated 6th October 1916). Vide also ante pp 19, 20.

Political Constitutions, viz. the Village System (ग्रामसंस्था) and the Panchayat (पंचायतसंस्था), had their origin in the Vedic *Samiti* (the *Village Community*) and the *Sabhâ* (the *Popular Assembly*), which may be said to have evolved out of the Religious Constitution or *Vidatha* (*Vide supra pp 46, 47, 48*).

It would, I think, be no exaggeration to observe that, so far as our Bhâratavarsha is concerned, there has evidently been a close connection between Religion on the one hand and Politics on the other. In fact, the constant and never ceasing Hindu-struggle for *spiritual emancipation* accounts, more than anything else, for our *innate love* of freedom, our *love* of independence, and even our *love of Constitution*.

Shivâjee the Great had, no doubt, planned and framed the *constitution* of his realm, in accordance with the ancient habit of mind of our country, and even in deference to its immemorial usage. Yet, he could not avoid making requisite changes therein, guided as he was by the exigencies of his time and the circumstances of the by-gone age. For, our ancient Rishis having been the law-givers and the law-expounders of India, had declared that all *Constitution*, whether Religious, Social, or Political, had its origin in the *Shruti* and the *Smriti*. The former has been known as the Vedas or the Voice of God *heard*

by deep Vedic thinkers, and the latter as but the *remembered* traditions.

Now, this Constitution, of which the perennial source was the Vedic Rishis, has been of organic growth. In fact, the accepted principle of all practical politics is that *constitutions are not made but grow*. And this fundamental principle has been as much rooted in the Indian mind as in that of the West. It would, therefore, be a fallacy, and would betray complete ignorance of history, to argue that all our knowledge of Constitution, Political Institutions, or Self-Government in India, was solely derived from the West, and that we were quite innocent of it, till we came in contact with England. Since, our Constitution or *Self-Government system*, our national spirit and *the idea of one nation*, our patriotism and *love of Āryāvarta*, our love of liberty and *love of independence*, have been germinating throughout Bhāratavarsha even from the time of the Vedas (supra pp 75 @ 88), which had given life to the *Samiti* and the *Sabhā*, supposed to be the daughters of Prajāpati (ante pp 47, 50).

These Political Institutions of Ind were thus the admirable specimens of *the unwritten maxims* of the Constitution, not to say of the positive *political and moral force* of the country. Nay, they had grown out of the social sense of

the people, had sufficed for all practical purposes, and certainly contained the germ of a model for the wider spheres of administrative economy, as could even now be seen in the shattered state of our present Village Communities. (*Vide supra pp 19, 22, 98*).

Obviously, the aforesaid politically important Public Bodies, that had their origin in the priceless service of the Brahmans, and that have been in existence from the Vedic period, appear to have lasted where nothing else has lasted ; and it is these that have undoubtedly contributed more than any other cause to the preservation of the people of India, through all the revolutions and changes which they have suffered, and have been in a high degree conducive to their happiness, and even to the enjoyment of a great portion of freedom and independence, as pertinently observed by Sir C. T. Metcalfe in the Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1832, (*supra p 98*).

In the circumstances, it is but natural that such of the Western *Savants* as are free from deep prejudice and ignorance of India, should appear, from their true knowledge of facts and of her ancient Political Institutions, to have unreservedly admitted and frankly observed as follows :—"The Brahmins of India first took in hand the work of evolving some sort of unity

out of the heterogeneous elements. They set up a standard of social and religious conduct, to which it became the ambition of the several tribes to approximate. The mission of the Brahmins and subsequently of the Buddhists, may be compared, not inaptly to that of the Church in the Middle Ages in Europe. It was, to quote Sir Nârayan's words, to bring the whole continent, in the one case of India and in the other of Europe, within the fold of oneness of tradition and ideal, in point of religion, social coherence, and also political constitution .. These (Village) Communities undoubtedly served a useful purpose in the remote past, when they were the only kind of civic organisation possible in the country. The Caste was a larger organisation than the Village community, because it represented a bond uniting persons who might be distributed in several neighbouring villages. Religious sects were still larger communal organisations, because their geographical distribution was much wider than even Caste....(*Vide The Leader in The Times of India. Dated 7th October 1916*).

Besides, Mr. G. S. Arundale also had, during the course of his Home Rule Lectures, observed that, India had been a Nation from the beginning of time, and there was not only a national sentiment in India, but also a national

life, such as no Western country, however progressive from the modern stand-point, could achieve for centuries to come.....' The Western modern system had been in existence in India from time immemorial. Local Self-Government in Ancient India had been infinitely more complete than any kind of Self-Government, local or otherwise, that the West had been able to evolve. As for national services, if the West desired to establish it on a sound basis, she must pocket her pride and beg the East for instruction.'

Chapter XII.

Our originality in all the branches of knowledge

AND

Present Aptitude for Self-Government.

We have had occasion to observe before, that there has been a general tendency in the West to suppose, ignoring all facts and genuine historical evidence, that "No Oriental nation had ever shown a trace of capacity for Self-Government" (*supra* p 17). While, some responsible persons even in well informed circles, seriously ask the question,—“Are Indians really fit at present to govern themselves?” In the circumstances, it becomes necessary to clear the ground, drive away the mist of deep ignorance and prejudice, render the atmosphere free of all impurities, and remove every obstacle that stands in the way of clear vision.

Now, I may here state that many of these facts are but plain truths frankly admitted, in respect of *our present capacity for Self-Government*. And these make manifest that we Hindus, or rather Indo-Aryans, are not a whit inferior to Europeans, in any matter whatever,

provided, of course, that we are given opportunities and facilities, equal to those offered to our European brethren.

The Reader probably well remembers that I have already placed before him in detail, the Vedic, Epic, and Buddhistic testimony, in respect of our Political Institutions and Self-Government of antiquity (*vide* Chapters ii, iii, iv, v). Ancient Ind had thereby made known to the world her most interesting polity of yore, declaring at the same time that, "the King was for the People," "not the people for the King" (*supra* pp 137-139); that, as such, the king had to be *elected* by the people, and was to be of *their choice* (pp 139-145); that the two *indigenous* Political Institutions of the country, viz. *Sabhâ* (सभा) or the Popular Assembly and *Samiti* (समिति) or the *Village Commune* had their peculiar functions and responsibilities (pp 47, 50, 127-129, 131, 132); that the debater in each Assembly having been endowed with *commanding eloquence* as also *powerfully charming speech*, used to carry off the palm and the pre-eminence in the Assembly (p 133); that the great maxim that "Union was strength," was even then known to our Vedic Ancestors and was carefully borne in mind (pp 114, 115); and that the children of the soil having had great *respect* for their nation, they had always entertained very

keen desire that no wicked person ever *governed* or lorded it over them (*pp* 115-116).

I have also endeavoured to show (*p* 99), that the king in the Vedic Age had not unlimited powers. Nay, even then, he was never allowed to transgress reasonable limits. Nor did our ancient Sires ever wish that he should turn out to be a despot or a tyrannical ruler. For, as ours was a *Constitutional Monarchy* even during the great Vedic period, the king was always kept within *Constitutional limits*; and steps were ever taken to see that he sympathized with his people as also with their legitimate aspirations, and properly respected their rights. (*Vide* Aitareya Brâhmanam viii. 15 ; *supra pp* 99, 109, 110, 116). As the natural consequence, the king in turn felt for his people and his nation, and left no stone unturned to secure their happiness; especially, as he was made aware of instances in which the high-handedness of kings was duly punished (*vide* Manu's Code vii. 40, 41; *supra p* 217).

In connection with this, therefore, it will perhaps not be out of place at this stage to remark, that the aforesaid facts have not only been freely granted and frankly accepted as true, but have been unflinchingly admitted even by foreigners and Anglo-Indians, to be faithfully portrayed. I would, accordingly, take this op-

portunity to quote herein extract from *The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, for the conviction of the Reader. This says, "Vedic society being founded on the patriarchal family, the government of the tribe was naturally monarchical. The king (*Raja*) was often hereditary, but" (owing to our extreme love of liberty), "sometimes he was elected, by the districts (*Vis*) of the tribe (*विश*). In return for his protection, he received from the people obedience and voluntary gifts—not regular taxes—and his power was limited by the popular will expressed in the tribal assembly (*Samiti*)." (*Vide The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Vol. ii. Edition 1908, p. 223).

This, I need hardly say, speaks volumes in respect of our love of independence and *Limited Monarchy, Constitutional Sovereignty* and *Self-Government* in Ind, even during early Vedic Ages, which we have often referred to, before. This, moreover, proves, beyond any manner of doubt, that despotism or high-handed rule *was certainly not the thing* which we were accustomed to, from our infancy. But, it was *the limited monarchy, the constitutional rule*, and the Government of our country by the *People's Assembly* (*Sabha* सभा) and the *Village Commune* or *Samiti* (समिति) which constituted *the Nation*, that we were familiar with, from our childhood;

keen desire that no wicked person ever *governed* or lorded it over them (*pp* 115-116).

I have also endeavoured to show (*p* 99), that the king in the Vedic Age had not unlimited powers. Nay, even then, he was never allowed to transgress reasonable limits. Nor did our ancient Sires ever wish that he should turn out to be a despot or a tyrannical ruler. For, as ours was a *Constitutional Monarchy* even during the great Vedic period, the king was always kept within *Constitutional limits*; and steps were ever taken to see that he sympathized with his people as also with their legitimate aspirations, and properly respected their rights. (*Vide* Aitareya Brâhmanam viii. 15 ; *supra pp* 99, 109, 110, 116). As the natural consequence, the king in turn felt for his people and his nation, and left no stone unturned to secure their happiness; especially, as he was made aware of instances in which the high-handedness of kings was duly punished (*vide* Manu's Code vii. 40, 41; *supra p* 217).

In connection with this, therefore, it will perhaps not be out of place at this stage to remark, that the aforesaid facts have not only been freely granted and frankly accepted as true, but have been unflinchingly admitted even by foreigners and Anglo-Indians, to be faithfully portrayed. I would, accordingly, take this op-

portunity to quote herein extract from *The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, for the conviction of the Reader. This says, "Vedic society being founded on the patriarchal family, the government of the tribe was naturally monarchical. The king (*Raja*) was often hereditary, but" (owing to our extreme love of liberty), "sometimes he was elected, by the districts (*Vis*) of the tribe (*विश*). In return for his protection, he received from the people obedience and voluntary gifts—not regular taxes—and his power was limited by the popular will expressed in the tribal assembly (*Samiti*)." (*Vide The Imperial Gazetteer of India*, Vol. ii. Edition 1908, p. 223).

This, I need hardly say, speaks volumes in respect of our love of independence and *Limited Monarchy*, *Constitutional Sovereignty* and *Self-Government* in Ind, even during early Vedic Ages, which we have often referred to, before. This, moreover, proves, beyond any manner of doubt, that despotism or high-handed rule *was certainly not the thing* which we were accustomed to, from our infancy. But, it was *the limited monarchy, the constitutional rule*, and the Government of our country by the *People's Assembly* (*Sabha* *सभा*) and the *Village Commune* or *Samiti* (*समिति*) which constituted *the Nation*, that we were familiar with, from our childhood;

and the same we enjoyed continuously for ages before, under the guidance of our hoary Vedic Fore-fathers.

But, above all, we had also shown, by quoting chapter and verse, that even so far back as the tenth and the eleventh, the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries, *we had enjoyed* the most coveted *Elective franchise* and *Representative Government*, all be it on a small scale, during the regime of the illustrious Chola Emperors and the Malabar Constitutional Monarchy. (*Vide supra pp 165 @ 175, 186 Et seque*).

In the circumstances, I respectfully venture to ask the Reader, if all this indicates any incapacity for Self-Government, or should, in any way, give the remotest cause to Mr. Balfour for observing that, "No Oriental nation had ever shown a trace of capacity for Self-Government." (*Supra p 17*)

But, to proceed. Our autonomy, the Reader will see, was in full swing in Ind, during early epochs, prior to the advent of foreigners in this sacred land, and she was then the only¹ seat, not excepting even Greece, of great intellectual wealth, the one abode of indigenous political

1 (a) In this wise, even Professor Weber has had to observe thus :—This "accounts still further for the superiority maintained and exercised by the Brahmans over the rest of the people"...(*History of Indian Literature. pp 21, 22. Edition 1882*).

(b) While Lord Elphinstone, the statesman and the historian, has also admitted "the early excellence of the

grandeur, moral elevation, material happiness, progress in Science, Philosophy, Arts, and Literature¹, ere yet the Pyramids had looked down upon the valley of the Nile, or even before Babylon and Palestine were born, or Persia had come to the front, or Greece and Rome—those cradles of but modern civilization, had housed only the tenants of the wilderness. (*Vide Thorn-*

Brahmans in all these branches of learning." (History of India. p 92. Second Edition; supra pp 11,12 *Et seque*, 23-25, 40, 66, 67, 261 Foot-Note 1).

(c) As to the real position of the Greeks in Literature, Science, and Art, I would respectfully invite the attention of the Reader to the observations made by a competent European critic and historian, in respect of the matter. (*Vide* Ockley's History of the Saracens. p 337. Edition 1857. supra pp 34, 35).

(d) Besides, in respect of our *Self-Government*, *Representative Institutions*, and *Constitutional Monarchy*, of which Greece boasts, see above Chapters iii @ ix.

(e) And yet, owing to pre-disposition, Sir Henry Maine would raise the Greeks up to the skies, by observing that, "Except the blind forces of Nature, nothing moves in this world which is not Greek in its origin." (*Vide* Maine's Village Communities; supra p 42). While Lord Macaulay would say, "Oh that wonderful people (the Greeks)! There is not one art, not one science, about which we may not use the same expression which Lucretius has employed about the victory over superstition," "Primum Graius homo." (The life and letters of Lord Macaulay. By the Right Hon. Sir George Otto Traveyan. Bart. M.P. Edition 1893. p 312).

1 Foreigners also have had to admit this fact, in respect of which therefore, F. De W. Ward, the late Missionary of America, has observed as follows:—"When under the native Rajas (Kings), India seems to have excelled in wealth, magnificence, and literature." India and the Hindoos. Ed. 1853. p. 72).

and the same we enjoyed continuously for ages before, under the guidance of our hoary Vedic Fore-fathers.

But, above all, we had also shown, by quoting chapter and verse, that even so far back as the tenth and the eleventh, the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries, *we had enjoyed* the most coveted *Elective franchise* and *Representative Government*, all be it on a small scale, during the regime of the illustrious Chola Emperors and the Malabar Constitutional Monarchy. (*Vide supra pp 165 @ 175, 186 Et seque*).

In the circumstances, I respectfully venture to ask the Reader, if all this indicates any incapacity for Self-Government, or should, in any way, give the remotest cause to Mr. Balfour for observing that, "No Oriental nation had ever shown a trace of capacity for Self-Government." (*Supra p 17*)

But, to proceed. Our autonomy, the Reader will see, was in full swing in Ind, during early epochs, prior to the advent of foreigners in this sacred land, and she was then the only¹ seat, not excepting even Greece, of great intellectual wealth, the one abode of indigenous political

1 (a) In this wise, even Professor Weber has had to observe thus :—This "accounts still further for the superiority maintained and exercised by the Brahmins over the rest of the people"...(*History of Indian Literature. pp 21, 22. Edition 1882*).

(b) While Lord Elphinstone, the statesman and the historian, has also admitted "the early excellence of the

grandeur, moral elevation, material happiness, progress in Science, Philosophy, Arts, and Literature¹, ere yet the Pyramids had looked down upon the valley of the Nile, or even before Babylon and Palestine were born, or Persia had come to the front, or Greece and Rome—those cradles of but modern civilization, had housed only the tenants of the wilderness. (*Vide Thorn-*

Brahmans in all these branches of learning." (*History of India*, p 92. Second Edition; *supra* pp 11,12 *Et seque*, 23-25, 40, 66, 67, 261 Foot-Note 1).

(c) As to the real position of the Greeks in Literature, Science, and Art, I would respectfully invite the attention of the Reader to the observations made by a competent European critic and historian, in respect of the matter. (*Vide* Ockley's *History of the Saracens*. p 337. Edition 1857. *supra* pp 34, 35).

(d) Besides, in respect of our *Self-Government*, *Representative Institutions*, and *Constitutional Monarchy*, of which Greece boasts, see above Chapters iii @ ix.

(e) And yet, owing to pre-disposition, Sir Henry Maine would raise the Greeks up to the skies, by observing that, "Except the blind forces of Nature, nothing moves in this world which is not Greek in its origin." (*Vide* Maine's *Village Communities*; *supra* p 42). While Lord Macaulay would say, "Oh that wonderful people (the Greeks)! There is not one art, not one science, about which we may not use the same expression which Lucretius has employed about the victory over superstition," "Primum Graius homo— (The life and letters of Lord Macaulay. By the Right Hon. Sir George Otto Traveyan. Bart. M.P. Edition 1893. p 312).

1 Foreigners also have had to admit this fact, in respect of which therefore, F. De W. Ward, the late Missionary of America, has observed as follows:—"When under the native Rajas (Kings), India seems to have excelled in wealth, magnificence, and literature." India and the Hindoos. Ed. 1853. p. 72).

ton's History of India. i. 2; the Author's *Aryá-vartia Home and Its Arctic Colonies*. pp 471, 472, *Et seque*).

Obviously, it was the extraordinary Indo-Aryan intellectual endowments and *genius* that made our hoary Ancestors the very head and front of the whole Aryan race (*vide supra* pp 12, 22, 25, 36, 40). It was this genius that made them the original thinkers. It was, in fact, this originality that made them the masters of early civilization. And it was this early, not to say *the most ancient Civilization*¹ of Ind., that

1 India has been called by Max Muller as the "ancient cradle of Eastern civilization" (Rig. Veda. Ed. 1862. vol-iv. p (xliii); while in respect of our Vedic Literature, he says, "in the Rig-Veda,...we shall have before us more real antiquity than in all the inscriptions of Egypt or Nineveh; not only old names and dates, and kingdoms and battles, but old thoughts,...old faith,...the old 'Man' altogether—old now but then young and fresh, and simple and real in his prayers and in his praises." (Rig-Veda Ed. p ix. vol iii). Moreover, he says, "the Veda" is the oldest book in existence, more ancient than the Homeric poems, because it presents an earlier phase of human thought and feeling." (History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature. Edition 1859. p 557).

It was obviously owing to the genuine Vedic testimony that Count Bjornstjerna has observed as follows:—"No nation on Earth can vie with the Hindus in respect of the antiquity of their civilization and the antiquity of their religion. (Theogony of the Hindus. p 50). And it was for this reason, that Mr. Halbed exclaimed with deep reverence, after discussing the four Yugas of the Hindus, thus:—"To such antiquity the Mosaic creation is but as yesterday; and to such ages the life of Methuselah is no more than a span."

raised our ancestors to greatness. It was the achievements of their mental capacity that made them the originators of the admirable monuments of Sanskrit Literature, of Science and Art, that even made them the first Poets¹ and Teachers of all the ancient nations of the world, in the most important branches of knowledge, such as Astronomy,² Primi-

1 (a) Max-Muller calls our Vedic Ancestors, as having been "far older ancestors and benefactors ...the ancestors of the whole Aryan race, the first poets of our thoughts, the first givers of our laws,"...(India. What Can it Teach us ? p 117. Edition 1883).

(b) *Vide* Mahā Bhārata and Manu Smṛiti ; ante pp 88-91.

2 Dr. Max-Muller vindicates the prior claims of the Indian Origin of ancient astronomy, and after discussing all the *pros* and *cons*, nay, after meeting argument by argument of Mr. Hardwick, Professor Lassen, Mr. Biot, Professor Whitney, Mr. Colebrooke, Professor Weber, and others, who are either for Chinese and Semitic, or Greek and Roman origin of Indian astronomical knowledge, says thus :—"I differ *toto cælo* from every one of these theories. I feel as strongly to-day (October 1852), as I did when, in the year 1846, I read at Paris the articles then published by Biot, that the Brahmans cannot have borrowed the idea of the Nakshatras from the Chinese," "these having been suggested to the 'Hindus,' he argues, 'by the moon's sidereal revolution, and intended to mark *equal* divisions of the heavens, which were originally twenty-seven, not twenty-eight.' (*Vide* Rig-Veda Edition. vol:iv. pp xlvī, xlvii).

Even Colebrooke says, "The Hindus had undoubtedly made some progress at an early period in the astronomy cultivated by them for the regulation of time. Their calendar, both civil and religious, was governed chiefly, not exclusively, by the moon and the sun...Their determination of

tive Religion¹ in its moral aspect, as also

the moon's synodical revolution,...is a much more correct one than the Greeks ever achieved. They had a division of the ecliptic into twenty seven and twenty eight parts, suggested evidently by the moon's period in days, and seemingly their own:...It was certainly borrowed by the Arabians." (Miscellaneous Essays. ii. 447. 1872).

Max-Muller further argues that, "The primitive division of the year into lunar months must have taken place previously to the first separation of the Aryan family... The proper names of months,...are peculiarly Indian. They exist in Sanskrit only, but not in Greek or Latin, (and were derived from the Nakshatras, which again were mostly derived from Vedic. Deities. *Vide* Whitney's *Sūrya-siddhānta*. p 203). If, therefore, we find the same names of the months in Sanskrit and Chinese, and if these names are inexplicable in the Chinese dictionary, surely the conclusion is evident, that they were borrowed by the Chinese from the Hindus, and not by the Hindus, from the Chinese." (Rig-Veda Edition, 1862. Vol iv. pp xli, xlii).

And again, for refuting the theories of those that claim either Semitic, Greek, Roman, or other foreign origin of Indian Astronomy, Max-Muller after calling "the Arabs... the docile pupils of the Hindus" (p lix ditto), says, "surely it would be a senseless hypothesis to imagine that the Vedic shepherds or priests went to Babylonia in search of a knowledge which every shepherd might have acquired on the banks of the Indus."..."and we may sum up without fear of serious contradiction, that no case has been made out in favour of a foreign origin of the elementary astronomical notions of the Hindus, as found or presupposed in the Vedic hymns." (India. What can it teach us ? Edition 1883. p 130).

1 In respect of Religion, Max-Muller writes thus :— "The Vedic religion is primitive, and taken as a whole, more primitive than any thing else that we are ever likely to recover in the whole history of our race."..."The chief attraction of Vedic literature (is) that it not only allowed us an insight into a very early phase of religious thought,

Philosophy,¹ Music,² and Medicine,³

but that the Vedic religion was the only one the development of which took place without any extraneous influences and could be watched through a longer series of centuries than any other religion," either Roman or Greek, or even Hebrew, in all which, as Dr Max-Muller himself admits, Scythian, Babylonian, Egyptian, Phœnician, as also Persian influences have been discovered. But, "In India alone, and more particularly in Vedic India, we see a plant entirely grown on native soil, and entirely nurtured by native air. For this reason, because, the religion of the Veda was so completely guarded from all strange infections, that it is full of lessons which the student of religion could learn nowhere else." (What can India Teach? Edition 1883. pp 124, 125). The Italics are mine (*The Author*).

Lastly, Max-Muller concludes, "After having thus carefully examined all the traces of supposed foreign influences that have been brought forward by various scholars, I think I may say that there really is no trace whatever of any foreign influence in the language, the religion, or the ceremonial of the ancient Vedic literature of India. As it stands before us now, so it has grown up, protected by the mountain ramparts in the North, the Indus and the Desert in the West, the Indus or what is called the sea in the South, and the Ganges in the East. It presents us with a home-grown poetry and a home-grown religion; and history has preserved to us at least this one relic, in order to teach us what the human mind can achieve if left to itself, surrounded by a scenery and by conditions of life that might have made man's life on Earth a paradise"...(India. What Can It Teach Us? Edition 1883. pp 139, 140).

1 As regards our philosophy *vide supra* pp 64, 65, and Max-Muller's History of Sanskrit Literature, Edition 1859, where, after describing the Hindus as a people "remarkably gifted for philosophical abstraction," he gives some account of their Monotheism and its antiquity. pp 565-570, 556-561.

2 *Supra* p 67. Foot Note 1. *Vide* also The Imperial Gazetteer of India. Vol. II. Edition 1908. pp 226, 227.

3 (a) Dr. Wise, late of the Bengal Medical Service, in his *Review of the History of Medicine*, says: "It is to the

Mathematics¹, (including Geometry, Trigonometry)

Hindus, we owe the first system of medicine." (Published in London, 1367).

(b) Dr. Royle, of the King's College, London, has, by his exhaustive inquiry, shown the deep debt which the Greeks owed to the Hindus, even in early ages, or say the fifth century B. C., in the Science of Medicine. Moreover, Hippocrates has been proved to be the docile disciple of the Hindus as he has *borrowed* his *Materia Medica* from the *Hindus*, although owing to ignorance in Europe, he was erroneously supposed to be, and called the "Father of Medicine." Says Dr. Royle, "Antiquity and independent origin of their (Hindu) medicine displays, I conceive, considerable merit, not only as showing that they had, at an early period, paid attention to what now constitute the several branches of Medicine, but also that they had discovered the various kinds of remedies, as well as the modes of applying them." (*Vide Antiquity of Hindu Medicine*. 1837). See also my Marathi work.—The Bhāratiya Sām-rājya, where I have given fuller details. Vol. iv. pp 103-126.

(c) The Rig-Veda, the most ancient document in the world, is replete with allusions to innumerable herbs, their varied properties, various *uses*, and different applications.

(d) As to *Anatomy* see above p 66. Foot note 4.

1 The "Hindus had discovered the first elementary laws of Geometry in the eighth century before Christ, and imparted it to the Greeks"; "but as the construction of altars, according to geometrical rules, fell into disuse, geometry was neglected, and geometrical problems were solved by Algebra." (*Vide History of Civilization in Ancient India*. By Ramesh Chander Dutt. 1. c. s. Edition 1891. p 725).

Says Elphinstone, "Their geometrical skill is shown, among other forms by their demonstrations of various properties of triangles,.....unknown in Europe till published by Clavius (in the 16 century. Edinburg Review, Vol. XXIX. p 158), and by their knowledge of the proportion of the radius to the circumference of a circle," (known in India in the fifth century, and not in Europe or out of India until

metry, Arithmetic, Algebra, &c.), Philology,¹ Com-

modern times, *vide*, *Sūrya Siddhānta*. As. Res. Vol. II. p 259). History of India pp 250, 251. "The progress made in other branches of Mathematical knowledge was still more remarkable than in Astronomy. In the *Sūrya Siddhānta*..... generally assigned to the fifth or sixth century, is contained a system of trigonometry which not only goes far beyond any thing known to the Greeks, but involves theorems which were not discovered in Europe till the sixteenth century." p 250.

"The Hindus are distinguished in Arithmetic by the acknowledged invention of the decimal notation; and it seems to be the possession of this discovery, which has given them so great an advantage over the Greeks in the science of numbers." p 251.

"From what has been already said it seems very improbable that the Indian Geometry and Arithmetic had been borrowed from the Greeks, and there is no other nation which can contest the priority in those sciences. The peculiarity of their (Hindus') method gives every appearance of originality to their discoveries in Algebra also." p 256.

"But, it is in Algebra that the Brahmans appear to have most excelled their contemporaries" (the Greeks) (p 251); and Diophantus, the first Greek writer on Algebra, has been admitted to be far behind and even inferior to Āryabhata (A. D. 360), the inventor of Algebra. (*Vide* Elphinstone's History of India. 2nd Edition. Vol I; and Colebrooke's Essays, Vol. II. pp 423, 429).

Now, the Rt. Rev. Dr. John William Colenso observes thus:—"Algebra, like many other branches of modern science, flourished in India long before it was naturalised in Europe. The Arabians whose mission made them a channel of communication between East and West were pupils of the Hindu Mathematicians." (History of Algebra, in the Elements of Algebra. Edition 1869. Part I. p V.)

1 Investigations in philology seem to have continued as early as the Brāhmaṇa period, B. C. 2500. (*vide* for instance the Shatapatha Brāhmaṇa, which is replete with etymologi-

parative Mythology,¹ Literature² in all its branches, &c. &c.

To this may also be added with advantage the Science of Government, or our ancient Vedic and Post-Vedic Polity, its Self-Government, as also its Constitutional Monarchy, of which the requisite details have already been supplied in the foregoing Chapters, in view of removing all erroneous notions, and exposing the ignorance of those who have been labouring under the false belief and mistaken notion, that our ancient ancestors—Vedic or Post-Vedic—, had no idea whatever of *autonomy* or *Constitutional Government*, that they had given no thought to this most important subject, and that, as such, they were totally in the dark, in respect of the *art* and *science* of Self-Government. But, the mist, it is hoped, will now disappear, and it will seem clear that they had made immense progress in the hoary past, even in this branch of the Science, of which the beginnings were made in Europe, by Greece and Rome, only centuries afterwards.

cal explanations. It is for this reason that Max-Müller says, "For explanations of old Vedic words, for etymologies and synonymous expressions, the Brāhmanas contain very rich materials." (History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature. Edition 1859. p 153).

1 Sir Henry Maine maintains that "India has given to the world Comparative Philology and Comparative Mythology. (Village Communities. Edition 1890. pp 210, 211. Supra p 25).

2 The subject of Sanskrit Literature is too vast to be dealt with here. The Reader, however, is requested to refer to a few particulars given before, in view of his having some idea in respect of the matter. (*vide supra* pp. 11 @ 15, 29, 31, 35).

Probably, difficulties seem to have vanished at the touch of our Ancestors, as they had the whole and immediate grasp, nay full view of the subject that came before them, whatever its nature ; just as,

".....The Sun in rising beauty dressed,¹
Looks to the westward from the dappled
East,
And marks, whatever clouds may interpose,
Ere yet his race begins, its glorious close,
An eye like his to catch the distant goal,
Or ere the wheels of verse begin to roll,
Like his to shed illuminating rays
On every scene and subject it surveys,—
Thus graced the man asserts a poet's name,
And the world cheerfully admits the claim."

In fact, in all our perplexities, whether *religious* or *political*, He—the *Invisible* behind the Visible, the *Infinite* within the Finite, the *Supernatural* above Natural, nay the Highest Power in this endless Universe, was with us, and had ever heard our prayers, whenever these were *united* and *sincere*.

And this makes me remember what was once remarked by the late Mr. Justice Rânade, on the Anniversary day of the Prârthanâ Samâj,—the 5th of December 1892. Said he, "**We (Hindus) are the Chosen People of God.**" (*Vide supra pp. 73, 74*). These were his words,

1 Cowper's Table Talk.

which, perhaps, were said *intuitively*. And curiously enough, we find the truth of the statement brought home to us, every-now and then.

I shall now endeavour to place before the Reader a few facts which clearly prove our inherent capacity for Self-Government, not only during the past ages, of which by the bye, (as shown in Chapters II @ IX), there are genuine historical records; but our aptitude for autonomy has become evident even in the present times. Some particulars, that were found necessary for illucidating various points as they cropped up incidentally, have already been noticed in the chapters relating to the subjects discussed. I shall, therefore, present here to the Reader further details that seem to be requisite. Obviously, *the past* will establish our hoary traditions in respect of our aptitude for Self-Government, as also for every thing else. While, *the present* will serve as a helpful study for those who stand in need of tangible evidence. Especially as, there are those again, who contend that *Past is past after all*; that it does not form an exception to the Nature's general law of "*Survival of the fittest*;" and that, if at all there was anything in the East worth mentioning, it had succumbed to the attacks of the progressive West and the onward march of its civilization. To such people, therefore, the living

examples of the present generation would surely be an answer in respect of our *undying capacity* for Self-Government and aptitude for managing our own affairs.

I would, however, at the commencement request the Reader to bear in mind that, the privilege of having the capacity for Self-Government, or love of managing one's own affairs, does not belong, and is not confined, to the West alone, or to the White man only. For, it is obviously the birth-right of all. To this, moreover, is to be added the fact, that we Bhâratas (Indo-Aryans or Hindus) have, hereditarily, not to say from the hoary Rig-Vedic times, been habituated to Self-Government. To charge us, therefore, with incapacity for Self-Government, or to declare to the world that, "No Oriental nation had ever shown a trace of capacity for Self-Government," is to utter something that has not only no meaning, but that is absolutely far from truth and groundless. And this sort of babbling about our unfitness has, below its surface, either gross selfishness or prodigious ignorance, as will be evident from the facts stated in the sequel.

But, apart from this, there is yet another view of the case, which, looked at from this stand-point, helps us still more in the matter, and affords further solution of the question.

Firstly then, we have to bear in mind our *past traditions*, continued without any interruption from generation to generation, uptil now. We have also to remember and never forget the fact that our ancient fore-fathers had ruled this great continent of Bhâratavarsha or India, firmly and wisely, and their rule had doubtless done immense good to the country (*supra pp. 25, 275, Foot-note 1*), because many of them were the ablest statesmen and foresighted rulers. In the circumstances, it would be but sheer folly to say or make ourselves and others believe that we are unfit to rule ourselves or manage our own affairs. As Indians, therefore, let us recognise our own worth and fitness, our value and importance. Since, this alone will not only engender *self-confidence*, but create in its turn *self-dependence*, both of which have been at present very badly needed, and would be all in all to us.

Inasmuch as, we are citizens of a great and ancient country ; our previous achievements are more glorious than those of other nations (*supra pp. 13, 14, 23, 24, 31, 35, 38, 40*) ; our past history is full of great deeds and amazing

valour¹, by which immense territory in different continents was won, large kingdoms founded, and innumerable colonies established all the world over; while, our earliest civilization having spread civic light everywhere, had carried with it even spiritual culture from end to end; nay, even our present condition is not at all one of which we need to be ashamed, as it exhibits neither a dull nor a monotonous record, but shows, on the contrary the most hopeful and progressive state.

Secondly, we have to note another very prominent fact, that it is the Indians who are working the British administration of India on all levels, except some higher ones, although even for such, there is a sufficient number of very capable and educated sons of the soil. But, they are shut out, in the interest of the ruling race. Yet, all subordinate services in India have been mainly administered and

1 To exculpate myself from any the least charge of exaggeration, I would here produce the testimony of a foreigner, who is also a historian. Says he, "The men of old time in India did deeds worthy of remembrance, and deserving of rescue from oblivion in which they have been buried for so many centuries." (Vide *Early History of India*. By Vincent A. Smith. Edition 1908, p. 3).

And, as Mr. Aiyar has aptly observed India unjustly suffers to-day in the estimation of the world, more through that world's gross ignorance of the achievements of the heroes of Indian History, than through the absence or insignificance of such achievements.

manned by Indians, who, speaking generally, even according to the European testimony of experts and officers, may be said to be 'very intelligent, quick to learn, more amenable to discipline than foreigners, who, says Mr. Tutwiler, are apt, "to dissipate,.....to get a swelled head, and to disregard discipline." (*Vide* Industry Commission, 11th December 1916. Statement and Evidence of Mr. T. W. Tutwiler, Manager, Tata Iron and Steel Co's. Works).

Thirdly, our Indian members of the Local and Imperial Councils (Legislative and Executive), have proved themselves to be not only *fit* for the duties entrusted to, or devolved on, them, but *fit* even for higher administrative functions; and Sir S. P. Simha, Sir Shankar Nayar, Mr. G. K. Gokhale, Mr. Chaubal, Mr. Ramesh Chandra Datta, and others, are instances in point.

Fourthly, in the Nadia District of Bengal, *Swarājya* or Self-Government in Indian hands, seems to have proved a success in all the important branches of administration. For, it has been reported (1916), that the 'District and Sessions Judge (of Nadia) was Mr. P. C. De, the District Magistrate Mr. S. C. Mukherjee, the District Police Superintendent Mr. Sen, and the Civil Surgeon Mr. B. C. Dhar. Thus, the District of Nadia was just then being ruled entirely by the Indian agency, and all would be

glad to know that the local administration was being managed very efficiently. This will speak for itself, as regards our *present capacity* for Self-Government, and aptitude for managing our own affairs.

Fifthly, the Indian States, which are feudatory and yet independent as regards their internal administration, are entirely managed by our Indian Administrators ; and some of these States, *e.g.* Baroda, Mysore, Travancore, &c., are the finest specimens of good Government. Nay, they are even ahead of British India, in many respects ; as for example, Education, Judicial Reforms, Industrial developments, &c., and these, very naturally, constitute the most important, not to say the sacred functions of Government. It would, therefore, not be out of place to mention here some of the most prominent Indian statesmen and ablest administrators, as also a few others of less fame, for information of the Reader. Sir Dinkar Rao, Sir T. Mādhav Rao, Purnia, Mr. Dādā Bhāi Nowroji, Sir Sâlar Jung, Divân Bahâdar Raghunâth Rao, Mr. Ramesh Chandra Dutta, Sir Shashia Shastri, Mr. Ranga Charlu, Mr. Gauri Shankar Ojha, Mr. Sheshadri Aiyer, Mr. B. L. Gupta, and others, had not only managed the various States with great skill, consummate ability, and conspicuous success, but had also proved their fitness for the highest ad-

ministrative posts, and vindicated, without the least shadow of doubt, the capacity of their countrymen for Self-Government.

Sixthly, as regards the capacity of our present indigenous Rulers of feudatory States for Self-Government or management of their own affairs, it may be said with just pride, nay without the least exaggeration, and even without fear of contradiction, that there are among these some that have been rightly said to be an example to, and even a model for, British India (*supra* p 38).

Seventhly, Liberty is but man's *birth-right*, and the national growth naturally attains its full height and perfect development, only in an unfettered state. Nay, as has been admitted by all, the rule of a foreign nation is not only inconsistent with national dignity, national grandeur, and even national self-respect, but has ever been supposed to be a *badge of inferiority*, not only racial but even intellectual.

Besides, foreign rule means the practical monopoly, as it pleases, of the higher grades of services and of every thing else, not to say of its exorbitant cost. Nay, the excessive costliness of the foreign machinery, is not its only evil. As a concomitant of it, there is again the moral degradation, which is of still greater magnitude, and has far-reaching consequences.

Since, as rightly observed by the late Honourable Mr. G. K. Gokhale, "A kind of dwarfing or stunting of the Indian race is going on under the present system. We must live all the days of our life in an atmosphere of inferiority, and the tallest of us must bend in order that the exigencies of the existing system may be satisfied. The upward impulse, if I may use such an expression, which every school-boy at Eton or Harrow may feel that he may one day be a Gladstone, a Nelson, or a Wellington, and which may draw forth the best efforts of which he is capable,—that is denied to us. The full height to which our man-hood is capable of rising can never be reached by us under the present system. The moral elevation which every self-governing people feel cannot be felt by us. Our administrative and military talents must gradually disappear, owing to sheer disuse, till at last our lot, as hewers of wood and drawers of water in our own country, is stereo-typed." (Statement before the Royal Commission, 1897).

There is again one more point which deserves consideration and requires illucidation. For, there are some who, though they pose as friends of India, and as such are bound to help her as *bona fide* guides, would urge or pretend to urge that, there is dissension yet amongst the Indians, as they have no nationality, and this

ministrative posts, and vindicated, without the least shadow of doubt, the capacity of their countrymen for Self-Government.

Sixthly, as regards the capacity of our present indigenous Rulers of feudatory States for Self-Government or management of their own affairs, it may be said with just pride, nay without the least exaggeration, and even without fear of contradiction, that there are among these some that have been rightly said to be an example to, and even a model for, British India (*supra p 38*).

Seventhly, Liberty is but man's *birth-right*, and the national growth naturally attains its full height and perfect development, only in an unfettered state. Nay, as has been admitted by all, the rule of a foreign nation is not only inconsistent with national dignity, national grandeur, and even national self-respect, but has ever been supposed to be a *badge of inferiority*, not only racial but even intellectual.

Besides, foreign rule means the practical monopoly, as it pleases, of the higher grades of services and of every thing else, not to say of its exorbitant cost. Nay, the excessive costliness of the foreign machinery, is not its only evil. As a concomitant of it, there is again the moral degradation, which is of still greater magnitude, and has far-reaching consequences.

Since, as rightly observed by the late Honourable Mr. G. K. Gokhale, "A kind of dwarfing or stunting of the Indian race is going on under the present system. We must live all the days of our life in an atmosphere of inferiority, and the tallest of us must bend in order that the exigencies of the existing system may be satisfied. The upward impulse, if I may use such an expression, which every school-boy at Eton or Harrow may feel that he may one day be a Gladstone, a Nelson, or a Wellington, and which may draw forth the best efforts of which he is capable,—that is denied to us. The full height to which our man-hood is capable of rising can never be reached by us under the present system. The moral elevation which every self-governing people feel cannot be felt by us. Our administrative and military talents must gradually disappear, owing to sheer disuse, till at last our lot, as hewers of wood and drawers of water in our own country, is stereo-typed." (Statement before the Royal Commission, 1897).

There is again one more point which deserves consideration and requires illucidation. For, there are some who, though they pose as friends of India, and as such are bound to help her as *bona fide* guides, would urge or pretend to urge that, there is dissension yet amongst the Indians, as they have no nationality; and this

makes them *unfit* for Self-Government. But, the charge may at once be courteously retorted by asking them, 'Pray, where on Earth does this dissension not exist?' Since, in this world, we meet with conflicting dualism every where. For instance, in Europe, England itself has Radicals, Liberals, Conservatives, Socialists, &c.; while, Ireland claims Nationalists, Unionists, Catholics, Protestants, &c.; and there are dissensions amongst them all. Nay, not very long ago, we witnessed the sorry and very ungraceful spectacle of bickering between Sir Edward Carson and Mr. Redmond; the one fighting tooth and nail for the Unionists and the Protestants of Ireland, or rather against the Home Rule for Ireland, and the other espousing the cause of the Nationalists and endeavouring to get the Home Rule for Ireland. Portugal, moreover, has her own rule; but with all that, there are factions in the country, and Royalists and Republicans have ever been found to be at loggerheads. Even America, with its independence and Self-Government, has two political parties, viz. pro-English and pro-German. Moreover, Switzerland, which is perhaps the best governed State in Europe, is composed of peoples of three different races and nationalities, viz. French, Italian, and German. Of the total population of the country, one-third speak French, one-third Italian, and the remaining

one-third German. These, besides, are not at all united in religion; and yet, this has not in the least prevented the country from rising to a man and claiming its independence. In like manner, Belgium, Walloon, and Flemish provinces are, (or rather were before the War), bound together by one nationality, although the latter have leanings towards Holland, and the former towards France.

In fact, as Lord Acton has pointed out, it may be said that while our connection with the race is natural and physical, our duty to the nation is sublimely political, not to say even morally great. Mr. C. F. Andrews of Delhi, therefore, rightly considers that the presence of different races or nationalities in a single State, is but a necessary condition of progress, and further observes, while scrutinising Lord Acton's ideas of nationality that, 'the political ideal which has been held up before India, during the countless generations of the past, has been exceptionally high.' Naturally, Hinduism, during countless centuries, has given a *common civilisation* for India. This has obviously made, and is still making, the Indian Continent a political unity, in spite of a thousand disintegrating forces. It is to Hinduism, with its off-shoot of Buddhism, that this great glory belongs; as, it was not content with the narrow racial boundary,

but included the whole continent in its embrace, from the northern Himalayas to the southernmost shores of Ceylon. There are few more imposing spectacles in history than this silent, peaceful penetration of Hindu civilization, till the farthest bounds of India were reached. And the effects of this penetration were not transient. It is the Hindu spirit that has unified the Continent. 'Even the Mahomedan Conquests', says Mr. Andrew with greater force, 'and the British supremacy, have done little more than add touches of light and shade to the background of Hinduism which has coloured the whole soil of India.'

If, therefore, the theory of Lord Acton be correct, then certainly a mixture of races under the *ægis* of foreign culture, which again had its origin in the Indo-Aryan civilization, is but a blessing, not to say an ideal, higher than that of exclusive nationality. And this being the case, Mr. Andrews declares in plain words that, "India has, in the Divine Providence, which guides the course of history, been blessed indeed. She has not been content with a low standard of temporary success. She has strained after that unity of which her philosophy is ever dreaming. Her passionate pilgrims' quest for the 'One without a second', which is the note of the Upanishads and the Vedanta, has not been im-

practicable, as has been so often falsely asserted. It has moulded history."

Thus, the presence of different creeds and nationalities, or mixture of races and peoples in a country, does not come in the way of national unity, as will be evident from the facts stated above.

Then crops up the question, in respect of the ignorance of the masses, or rather of the microscopic minority of the educated few, in proportion to the dumb millions of the soil. This, however, may well be answered by giving a few concrete examples, as these will speak for themselves. In 1838, Lord Durham was sent from England, as Governor General of Canada, where, after some time, he made a report to the Home Government, as regards the general condition of the country, and described it thus in the said report, which has been considered to be one of the ablest and most inspiring of the State documents, ever submitted to Parliament:—

"It is impossible to exaggerate the want of education amongst the inhabitants. No means of instruction have ever been provided for them, and they are almost universally destitute of the qualifications of reading and writing."

Although, the hatred of races is not publicly avowed on either side, yet, all the British are on one side, and all the French on the other. The

mutual dislike of the two classes extends, beyond politics, even to social life, where all intercourse is confined to persons of the same origin. In this respect, therefore, Lord Durham had naturally written as follows :—"I found two nations warring in the bosom of a single State. I found a struggle not of principles but of races "..... "more calculated to produce natural misunderstanding, jealousy, or hatred.".....

"The French population of Lower Canada possesses neither such (Municipal) institutions, (nor any popular initiative). Accustomed to rely entirely on the Government, it has no power of doing anything for itself, much less of aiding the Central authority."...

"In the rural districts of Lower Canada, habits of Self-Government are almost unknown, and education so scantily diffused, as to render it difficult to procure a sufficient number of persons competent to administer the functions that would be created by a general scheme of popular local control "

Yet, all this notwithstanding, Lord Durham had recommended the grant of responsible Government to the Colony, even when he knew very well that it was altogether destitute of the requisite qualifications for Self-Government. But, above all, the most strange, not to say extremely ludicrous fact was that, even the

Home Government thought the Colony *fit* for the grant of Self-Government, when the same favour has been persistently denied to *the really fit, the highly civilized,*¹ and *the far advanced* Indians. (*Vide* Supra pp. 23, 24, 36. 37, 89, 200, 276, and Chapters VII, VIII, IX.).

1 (a) M. Louis Jacolliot designates our Indo Aryan Civilization as "extraordinary pristine civilization, which we (Europeans) have never yet surpassed"...p 21, "civilization without parallel."...p. 23, "that India has...given to the world."...p 30. (*The Bible in India*).

"Enquirers who have adopted Egypt as their field of research, and who have explored and re-explored that country from temple to tomb, would have us believe it the birth-place of our (European) Civilization. There are some who even pretend that India adopted from Egypt her castes, her language, and her laws, while Egypt is, on the contrary, but one entire Indian emanation." p 20.

"Other writers dazzled with admiration of Hellenic light, find it every where, and give themselves up to absurd theories," p 20. [*vide* for instance, the observations of Maine and Macaulay. Supra p 275, Foot-Note (e)].

(b) Besides, says Dr. Max Muller, "*Nor* are the Indians looked upon any longer as an illiterate race...On the contrary, they are judged now by the same standard as Persians and Arabs, Italians or French ; and, measured by that standard."...(pp 90, 91).

"But, there are other things, and, in one sense, very important things, which we too may learn from India."

"If I were to look over the whole world to find out the country most richly endowed with all the wealth, power, and beauty that nature can bestow—in some parts a very paradise on earth—I should point to India. If I were asked under what sky the human mind has most fully developed some of its choicest gifts, has most deeply pondered on the greatest problems of life, and has found solutions of some

Education, therefore, is not an indispensable condition of, or even a requirement precedent to, Self-Government. Probably, by giving *Self-Government* to the Canadians in advance of their fitness, the Home-Government had the parental desire to prepare them for, and initiate them into, the responsible duties of Self-Government. This was certainly as it should have been.

Another instance of the really praiseworthy intention and act of the Government of America as also its most liberal spirit,—without attempting in the least to put in any lame excuses in the shape of the ignorance of the masses, or the convenient plea of the interests of the *educated few* having been opposed to those of the millions of the people of the country, of which we shall speak presently—is found in the Philippines.

of them, which well deserve the attention even of those who have studied Plato and Kant—I should point to India. And if I were to ask myself from what literature we, here in Europe, we who have been nurtured almost exclusively on the thoughts of Greeks and Romans, and of one Semitic race, the Jewish, may draw that corrective which is most wanted in order to make our inner life more perfect, more comprehensive, more universal, in fact more truly human, a life, not for this life only, but a transfigured and eternal life—again I should point to India.” p 6. (*vide* India. What can it Teach us ? pp 6, 90, 91. Edition 1883).

(c) Mr. Dadabhai Newroji, our Grand Old Man, calls the Indo-Aryans or the Hindus, “*the earliest civilisers of the world.*”

Here, the Americans are but giving to the Filipinos practical lessons in politics. The basic policy of the Governing Body at Manila is not only to give liberal education to the Filipinos, but even to teach them to be self-supporting, self-dependent, honest, and working citizens, in view evidently of enabling them to make appreciable progress in all sorts of industries, arts, sciences, &c., and preparing them for Self-Government. The reason is obvious. For, the Americans sincerely desire to give Self-Government to the Filipinos. They, therefore, are endeavouring to equip them with the requisite education, for making them fit to govern themselves ; thus proving and showing to the world thereby, that, *where there is will there is way.*

But, what of India ? India of hoary antiquity and of very ancient civilization ! India of fathomless Literature and of the richest store of knowledge ! India that has been habituated to *Self-Government* (as has been amply proved in the foregoing Chapters), from the remotest Rig-Vedic times ! India that had attained to the highest pitch of civilization, when the other nations on the Earth were either not yet born, or were crawling on all the fours (*vide supra pp. 30, 31, 36, 37, 40, 101, 102*) ! India that has established her fitness for autonomy by deeds, and fully conscious of her destiny, has

been *peacefully* and *constitutionally* struggling for Freedom ! India that has been waiting and waiting for self-government, with marvellous patience, and very eagerly expecting the fulfilment of her desire ! India that has been wishing with longing eyes the carrying into effect of the promises¹ spontaneously given by our gracious Sovereign and her great Representatives ! But, the Government reply in store for India has been, and would perhaps, as usual, be, either "*Not yet,*" or "*Still Unfit,*" or "*Time Not Ripe.*" I would, therefore, only request the

1 (a) The Queen's Proclamation of 1858, and the solemn pledges given therein.

(b) Lord Lytton,—the Viceroy of India's declaration, for maintaining Proclamation-pledges, on the assumption of the title of Empress. (1st January 1876).

(c) Queen-Empress-Jubilee Assurance (1887), to maintain unswervingly the principles laid down in the Proclamation of 1858.

2 (a) This is borne out by the fact that, Mr. Curtis of the Round Table and three others, viz. Sir James Meston, Lieut.-Governor of the United Provinces, Mr. Marris, and Sir Valentine Chirol have drawn out a plan of the form of Government only fit for the Indians, (as they suppose), in a letter of 11th November 1916, now widely circulated. This letter was revised by them in detail, and may as such be taken as representing their joint view. The gist of the letter appears in a nutshell to be only this:—'Government accepts the opinion (of the Nation) only where it can,' and 'it looks to a time,—however remote, when it will be able to transfer that responsibility to a section of Indians, sufficiently large.'

Reader to carefully study all these facts, and to look at this picture and that.

Now, turning for a while to John Stuart Mill, in respect of Education-test in Self-Government, we find that he hardly thinks *Education*

We take this opportunity to state here by the way that, while this was in the Press, Mr. Curtis's *Letter to the People of India* appeared, in which he has modified his views and expressed regret for errors in respect of certain points, in the letter in question.

(b) There is again the poisonous sting of Lord Sydenham,—the ex-Governor of Bombay, thrust at the expense of the educated few, not to say even sincere patriots of India, with the one-sided views presented to the Public in the interest of the Bureaucracy ; and these appear very clear from his Article in the *Nineteenth Century And After*, (December 1916). Here, he says, "Practical politics are not understood in India" p. 1123. "All (suggestions of the signatories, viz. the Congress leaders and the memorialists of the remarkable document proposing Reforms) are directed to the attainment of power and advantages for a section of the small Western educated class" (p 1123), which, he says, "is bent on securing power for itself." p 1119.

(c) "The Briton.....is able to draw closer to the real people of India than the memorialists who, in their name, have demanded the control of Government." p 1125.

(d) "No classes would more bitterly resent the assumption of power by the political *intelligentsia* than the warlike clans of India,.....which already regard with alarm the growing pretensions of this section." p 1125.

(e) "In the East, the frankest policy is always the best. Let the Government, plainly and at once, reaffirm the principle that in no circumstances will any surrender, or, weakening of paramount British power in India be

as a necessary or even a material factor in the matter of Self-Government. And, as a matter of fact, in the case of Liberia, we see but half educated emigrants from America, actually

tolerated"..... p 1126. " Let it be announced, in firm language which cannot be mistaken, that the constitution of the Legislative Councils,.....will remain unchanged." p 1126.

(f) To this may be added the public speech made on 24th May 1917 in the Madras Council by His Excellency the Governor, Lord Pentland, as therein appear some remarks discouraging Home Rule, and administering angry rebukes, warnings, and threats.

(g) Moreover, as pointed out by our much esteemed Grand Old Man—Mr. Dadabhai Nowroji, (*vide Poverty And Un-British Rule in India*, Edition 1901. pp vii-xi), the evils of the present system of the British Indian Government, have remained in subterfuges, or in subtle and ingenious forms, even to the present day. Since, in a Report, dated 20th January 1860, 'A Committee of five members of the Council of the Secretary of State for India have declared the British Government to' "be exposed to the charge of keeping promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope."

(h) Besides, 'Lord Salisbury, in reply to Lord Northbrook's pleading for the fulfilment of British solemn pledges, said it was all "political hypocrisy." (Hansard. 9th April 1883).'

(i) And last but not least, 'Lord Lytton, as Viceroy of India, in a Minute referred to in the despatch of the Government of India, of 2nd May 1878, said: "No sooner was the Act (1833) passed than the Government began to devise means for practically evading the fulfilment of it.....We have had to choose between prohibiting them and cheating them, and we have chosen the least straightforward course. ...(these) are all so many deliberate and transparent subter-

establishing a Republic there, at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Even in Europe, it will appear that education has not at all played an important part in determining the form of Government, either Representative or Aristocratical, Monarchical or Imperial. For instance, Portugal and France have each 56 and 78 per cent of educated population respectively; and yet, they have a Republican form of Government. While Norway and Sweden, though they claim the largest or 97 per cent as their educated class, have practically an *absolute Monarchy*. In like manner, Germany with her 91 per cent of the literate population, has only an Imperial sway; and England, with its 87 per cent of the educated class, has but limited Monarchy.

Besides, if we go back still further, we shall at once perceive that the relation between Education and Politics is simply nominal, and that illiteracy had never come in the way of securing political rights and political privileges; except obviously in cases, where *might was right*,

inges for stultifying the Act and reducing it to a dead letter.....I do not hesitate to say that both the Government of England and of India appear to me up to the present moment unable to answer satisfactorily the charge of having taken every means in their power of breaking to the heart the words of promise they had uttered to the ear."

(j) In like manner, 'the Duke of Argyll has said to the same effect. [*vide infra* p 308 Foot-Note 1 (a)].

and where some desired pretext was wanted for conveniently putting off things to an indefinitely remote period. For example, during the reign of John,—the despotic king of England, education was probably at its lowest ebb,¹ as the generally literate class of clergy or ecclesiastics was treated with scorn, on account of their unusual ignorance and illiteracy. While, the uneducated barons hardly knew how to write, as they could sign their names only by scrolls and marks. Yet, they wrested the Magna Charta from the King, and this obviously was one of the most important Political Documents (15th June, 1215 A. D.).

Then, again another objection is advanced against the natural claims and legitimate demands of the Indians, when they, as a matter of fact, stand truly represented by the educated classes. But, even here the argument is put forth that the masses are silent; that they have not joined in the cry for Self-Government; that

1 In this respect, Thomas R. Shaw, M. A., writes thus:—"The Anglo-Saxon learning gradually died out by the middle of the twelfth century." (p 21).

"The displacement of the Saxon bishops and abbots seems to have arisen from contempt for their illiteracy..... (p 21).

"An age of violence and oppression permitted but little popular literature, in the proper sense." (p 21).

[Vide History of English Literature. Edited by Sir William Smith. 22nd Edition. 1897].

the interests of the few educated classes are opposed to those of the millions of the people of the country ; that *the educated few only have demanded the control of Government in the name of the people* ; and that the latter will be oppressed by the former, if the protecting band of Government were withdrawn. (*vide supra* p 301, Foot-Note. *b, d.*)

This ingenious yet insidious suggestion is so flippant, that it beats all reason, and as such, cannot stand the light of facts, nor the analysis of truth. For, in all countries, it is only the eminent few that always speak for the masses and the nation at large.

In fact, in every country, it is always the educated few that are ever supposed to represent the masses or the people, and even to speak for them for guarding their interests, as well as for protecting their rights. The masses roughly declare the symptoms of their complaint ; while, the educated classes not only know the exact seat of the disease, but, being themselves skilful workmen, are able to apply the remedy in a scientific way, and also according to the rules of art. They, therefore, shape the desires of the masses into a perfect form, and opportunely fit the utensil to the use. Under the circumstances, it would be but cruel, not to say even shocking and ungrateful, to

distort facts, or impute sinister motives to the educated few, the very flower of the people of this country, when base designs have no existence at all, except in the imagination of those who have thought fit to thus insidiously prefer the charge which has no foundation in the least.

Surely, the educated classes of India have, owing to their knowledge of the people, shown even greater anxiety and solicitude for the welfare and advancement of their countrymen, during the last quarter of a century, than foreign rulers or officials, (barring of course eminent exceptions to whom we shall never be too grateful), between whom, therefore, and the people, there is absolutely nothing in common. Moreover, we, by all means, know our people better than foreigners, owing to our knowledge of sundry facts, of our habits, of our languages, and our common Mother-Country,—an element of material importance, which, however, is almost always absent in the case of foreigners. (*vide* Hon. Mr. Choubal's and Justice Abdul Rahiman's criticisms, para 18, Lord Islington's Public Services Commission. Report. Vol. 1.) Of course, this is, in no way, meant for any disparagement to the Bureaucracy or the Foreign Service. But, these are facts, which cannot be concealed or ignored, and as such, must be placed before the Reader; especially, as the educated class and the *elite*

of the nation, have been considered by the bureaucracy to be in no way *Representatives* of the masses. Because, as declared or rather misrepresented by Lord Sydenham, they demand the control of Government in the name of the real people of India, to whom, he boastfully asserts, "the Briton is able to draw closer," and to whose interests, he (the Briton) looks with greater attention than "the educated class," or "the memorialists," or "the political *intelligentsia*," as they are styled, whose 'growing pretensions,' Lord Sydenham has been pleased to say, 'the warlike clans already regard with alarm.' [*vide supra* p 301. Foot-note *b, c, d*].

But, there appear grave reasons to doubt the veracity of this peroration. Firstly, because it is replete with the usual misrepresentations. Secondly, past events have not only revealed what has actually been passing below the surface, but have, moreover, shown that all is not gold that glitters; nor is any thing really that, which so seems to the eye, or which has been declared as such; that, blood after all is thicker than water; that there is more of words, more of tall talk, more of prevarication, more of empty promises, but less of deeds, less of sincerity, less of action in the way of carrying

out the promises, a fact admitted by responsible¹ Statesmen of England, by even the highest authorities, and also by the Representatives² of the Crown. Thirdly, the most recent Behar incident, the notice served on that great patriot of India Mr. Gāndhi, and the correspondence in respect of the matter that passed between him and the Government Officials, show that there is *loose the screw* somewhere in the system and person-

1 (a) Says His Grace the Duke of Argyll,—the Secretary of State for India, thus :—...“ I must say that we have not fulfilled our duty, or the promises and engagements which we have made ...“ Lord Monteagle complained...with great force that while professing to open every office of profit.....under the Crown to the Natives of India,..... we practically excluded them by laying down regulations as to fitness which we knew Natives could never fulfil.” 1873.

(b) Lord Salisbury's views also deserve notice (*vide ante p. 302 Foot-note h*).

2 (a) Lord Lytton,—the Viceroy of India's Minute in the Government of India's Despatch of 2nd May 1878, has already been noticed. (*vide supra p. 302 Foot-note i*).

(b) In 1883, Lord Northbrook pleaded, for the fulfilment of British solemn pledges, the Act of Parliament of 1833, the Court of Directors' explanatory despatch, and the great solemn Proclamation of 1858. It was then that Lord Salisbury seeing that the pledges were not fulfilled, had replied to say : “ My Lords, I do not see what is the use of all this political hypocrisy.”

The above extracts have been taken from Mr. Dādā-bhai Nowroji's “Poverty and Un-British Rule in India.” Edition 1901. pp 96, 317, 318.

nel of administration; that with the white planters as employers, the Ryots engaged on the Indigo plantations in Tirhut, have not had their grievances duly redressed; that Mr. Gândhi's object, as the Government well knew, was supremely *huminitarian*; that Mr. Gandhi was moreover, called by the Public men of Behar; that he had accepted the invitation to see for himself the condition of the Ryots of the district; and that he had sojourned in the district *to study the problem on the spot* with the requisite care and caution, without the remotest intention of creating the least agitation.

Yet, all this notwithstanding, the District Magistrate of Champaran, at the instance of the Commissioner of Tirhut Division, served a notice on Mr. Gândhi. Nay, he thereby ordered him "to abstain from remaining in the District;" and, more than this, he further required him "to leave it by the next available train."

However, that veteran passive resister Mr. Gandhi, undaunted by the unpleasant service of Notice, was equal to the occasion, and with admirable composure and equanimity, had replied thus:—"Out of a sense of public responsibility, I feel it to be my duty to say that, I am unable to leave this district; but if it so pleases the authorities, I shall submit to the order, by suffering the penalty of disobedience."

"I most emphatically repudiate the Commissioner's suggestion that my object is likely to be agitation. My desire is purely and simply for a genuine search for knowledge, and this I shall continue to satisfy, so long as I am left free."

Subsequently, Mr. Gandhi was tried before the Deputy Magistrate of Motihari. But, the judgment was postponed; and wiser counsels having prevailed, the Government of Behar discreetly withdrew the notice against Mr. Gandhi, and rectified the mistake, howsoever late, made by the Commissioner of Tirhut Division and the District Magistrate of Champaran.

Here, therefore, we beg respectfully to ask, if all this is Briton's drawing "closer to the real people of India," as said by Lord Sydenham [ante p. 301, Foot-Note (c)]; or, if this, in any way, shows that the "relations between the planters and the ryot had engaged the attention of the administration since the sixties," as declared by Mr. L. F. Morshead, Commissioner of Tirhut Division, in his letter to the District Magistrate, dated 13th April 1917. (*vide* The Modern Review. No. for May 1917. pp 604, 605).

Naturally enough, this makes us pause for a while, for bringing home to the Reader, what Babu Surendra-Nath Banerji had exclaimed,

while speaking on the Self-Government Resolution in the Bengal Provincial Conference. Said he: 'We are told that *we are not the Representatives* of the labouring masses. We are *not their guardians* and their *spokesmen*, but a foreign bureaucracy.' 'In whose interest, let me ask, did Mr. Gandhi take his sojourn to Behar, and *in whose interest was it that the officials barred him out at first*?' ?

But, to proceed. I now think it desirable at this stage, to devote a little space to a few weighty observations of some eminent statesmen and practical politicians, to enable the Reader to see in a prominent way the fact that, the development of the *Self-Governing Institutions* that exist this day, was achieved not by any *sudden stroke of pen* or of statesmanship, but by gradual steps, steady progress, and the usual process of evolution, which, by and by, not only tended to unite all classes and elements of discord, but also raised them to the level of their enhanced responsibilities. Having had, therefore, these things in view, our most experienced statesman and veteran politician, Mr. Dadabhai Nowroji says as follows:—"It is futile to tell me that we must wait till all the people are ready. The British people did not so wait for their Parliament. We (Indians) are not allow-

ed to be fit for 150 years. We can never be fit till we actually undertake the work and the responsibility. While China in the East and Persia in the West of Asia are awakening, and Japan has already awakened, and Russia is struggling for emancipation,—and all of them despotisms,—can the free citizens of the British Indian Empire continue to remain subject to despotism—the people who were among the first civilisers of the world? Modern world owes no little gratitude to these early civilisers of the human race. Are the descendants of the earliest civilisers to remain, in the present times of spreading emancipation, under the barbarous system of despotism, unworthy of British instincts, principles, and civilisation?”

Moreover, there is yet another aspect of the question, which I must present to the Reader for his mature consideration. Mr. John M. Robertson, M. P., in the very practical views in respect of, and in his sensible Article on, *The Rationale of Autonomy*, contributed to the first Universal Races-Congress, held in 1911, makes the under-mentioned remarks :—

“ Only by development, out of unfitness obviously is fitness attainable. Yet, the bare fact of unfitness is constantly posited as if it were the fixed antipodes of fitness. It is commonly put, for instance, as the decisive and

final answer to any plea for the gradual development of self-governing institutions in India, that if India were evacuated by the British forces, there would ensue civil war, if not a new war of conquest. That is of course an even superfluously valid argument against the evacuation of India, which no politician is known ever to have suggested. But, it is put as if the bare potentiality were a demonstration of the unfitness of the Indian peoples collectively, for any kind of institution tending ever so remotely towards autonomy. Now, within the English-speaking world, the mother-country had civil wars in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; there was civil war between mother-country and colonies towards the end of the eighteenth; and again, within the independent United States and within Canada, in the nineteenth;—all this in a ‘race’ that makes specially high claims to self-governing faculty. On the Imperialistic principle, a Planetary Angel with plenary powers would have intervened to stop the ‘premature experiment’ of Anglo-Saxon self-government, at any one of the stages specified—if indeed he had ever allowed it to begin.” “The demand that the latter (the subject people) shall maintain an attitude of humble acquiescence for an indefinite time, in the hope that when they have ceased to ask for anything, they will spontaneously be given it,

is quite the most senseless formula ever formed in any political discussion. Peoples so acquiescent would be the most thoroughly unfit for self-government that have yet appeared."

Lastly, Lord Macaulay the well-known Essayist, statesman, and the jurist, has rightly observed :—"Many politicians of our time are in the habit of laying it down as a self-evident proposition, that no people ought to be free, till they are fit to use their freedom. The maxim is worthy of the fool in the old story, who resolved not to go into the water till he had learnt to swim. If men are to wait for liberty till they become wise and good in slavery, they may indeed wait for ever." (*Vide Macaulay's Essays. Critical and Historical-Milton. pp 19,20. Longmans, Green, and Co. Edition 1877*).

With these patent facts before the Public, it is but natural that his Lordship the Bishop of Madras, should have with great discernment observed that, "We need to realise that we cannot now base the Government of India upon any other foundation than that of the will of the Indian peoples; that we are here as servants of the Indian people and not as their masters, that a foreign bureaucracy can only be regarded as a temporary form of Government; and that our ultimate aim and object must be to enable India to become a self-governing part of the British

Empire, and to develop her own civilization upon her own lines."

In the circumstances, it would be but captious perverseness and an undesirable attitude to ask us Indians, on frivolous grounds, to indefinitely wait, especially, when as a matter of fact, they are fit to rule themselves, have, moreover, shown their aptitude in every way in the matter, and above all, have even been habituated to *Self-Government* from the remotest past, as has been shown in the previous Chapters.

But, with all these circumstances in our favour, with the ancient traditions of our love of *Liberty* before the eyes of the British bureaucracy, nay with the fresh example of the Americans¹ in the Philippines to guide the Britishers, the policy of distrust yet *reigns supreme* in India, in the bureaucratic circle; when, even for their own interest and in justice to our deep loyalty, such destructive policy should have been abandoned by them ere long.

In this matter, the late lamented Mr. Gokhale had, with penetrative wisdom and great

1 On the 12th of January 1917, the Philippine Islands and the Archipelago obtained complete autonomy under American protection and suzerainty, both the Lower and the Upper Houses of the Legislature having now become elective. Obviously, the Government of the Philippines furnishes a splendid example of steady and progressive political evolution of which the goal is but perfect *self-rule*.

foresight, actually made an appeal to Government to "inaugurate a policy of greater trust." But, Government would pay no attention to it. Goddess Nemesis, however, having been on the watch, Mr. Gokhale could have had probably no other alternative than to declare boldly, and yet in a prophetic tone that, "*Time and events will necessitate a change*, and true statesmanship lies in an intelligent anticipation of that change." For, said he, "After all, it is only confidence, that will beget confidence, and a courageous reliance on the people's loyalty will alone stimulate that loyalty." (Budget Speech. 1906).

In like manner, the Hon. Mr. Choubal also wrote, with feelings of great regret, and under stress of circumstances, in the proper discharge of his duty, as follows:—"Perhaps the truth, however unpalatable, is that there are still a number of the average English officials in India, who have a distrust and suspicion about the educated Indian."

The Hon. Mr. Choubal then gave reasons for this their conduct, and said, "The explanation of this is probably that given by Sir P. M. Mehta in his evidence—that the English-official does not like independence, the self-assertion, and the self-respect, which come naturally in the wake of education. As Dr. Wordsworth stated in his evidence before the last Commission,

"deferential ignorance, conciliatory manners, and plentiful absence of originality and independence, are now, and will always be at a premium". It is high time that this shibboleth was exploded." (*Vide* Paragraph 18 of the Report of Lord Islington's Commission on the Public Services of India. Vol. I).

Evidently, it was owing to this fact of great moment, that even the American Governor General Harrison, while addressing the Filipino people and the Cabinet, had, with great emphasis, pointedly expressed that, "the backbone of any government or administration is complete confidence and harmony."

The policy of distrust has naturally landed our Rulers in sore anxiety, in the hour of need. Especially, as they have ignored the lessons of history, and had turned a deaf ear to what was already foreseen and ably pointed out by Mr. Gokhale some years ago, in the Legislative Council, with great pertinence. Said he, "The experts who accompanied the Russian and Japanese armies in the late war, have declared that the Indian army will be found too small, if a great emergency really arises." "Everywhere else in the civilised world, the standing army is supported by a splendid system of reserves, and the nation is behind them all." "No pouring out of money like water, on mere *standing batta-*

lions, can ever give India the Military strength and preparedness, which other civilised countries possess, while the whole population is disarmed, and the process of de-martialisation continues apace." "At the present moment, India is about the only country in the civilised world, where the people are debarred from the privileges of *citizen soldiery*." (Budget Speech. 1906, 1903).

Mr. Gokhale then, in a lucid and eloquent speech, put his arguments strongly before the Government of India and addressed the Viceroy thus :—"My Lord, I respectfully submit that it is a cruel wrong to a whole people to exclude them from all honourable participation in the defence of their hearths and homes, to keep them permanently disarmed, and to subject them to a process of demartialisation, such as has never before been witnessed in the history of the world."

Moreover, further statement was made with advantage, which being still more important, I beg to produce it here, for information of the Reader. Said Mr. Gokhale :—"Lord George Hamilton once told an English audience that there were millions of men in India, who were as brave as any people on the face of earth. Leaving such material, in the country itself, neglected, the Government has thought fit

to enter into an alliance with a foreign power—and that, an Asiatic-Power, which once borrowed its religion from us, and looked up to us—for the defence of India ! Japan came under the influence of Western ideas only forty years ago, and yet already, under the fostering care of its Government, the nation has taken its place by the side of the proudest nations of the West. We have been under England's rule longer than forty years", (nay, for more than one hundred years), "and yet we continue to be hewers of wood and drawers of water in our own country, and of course we have no position any where else. My Lord, things cannot continue—they must not continue—much longer, on so unsatisfactory a basis "... "My Lord, such growing distrust of the people, after so many years of British rule, is to be deplored from every point of view ; and not until a policy of great trust is inaugurated, will the military problem, or indeed any other problem in India, be satisfactorily dealt with". (Budget Speech. 1906.)

To this distrust, may also be added the self-interest of the Ruling Class and their desire to get the whole cream of every thing for themselves. When these obviously get the better of any other consideration, the lame plea of our unfitness is always put forward as a safe-guard against all clamour. But, this no more serves

any purpose at all, as Indians had shown, and have been showing their capacity for Self-Government on all occasions, whenever opportunity was or is offered to them for proving it. I, therefore, venture to place before the Reader the ripe experiences of Mr. V. P. Madhav Rao, who says as follows, in respect of our present fitness for Self-government, and bears eloquent testimony to the political capacity of different classes of Indians from the illiterate ryot to the highly educated. Says he, while speaking of the Mysore Representative Assembly :—"I had the privilege of taking part in its proceedings in one capacity or another almost from the beginning of the Institution, for a period of twenty five years, until my retirement as Dewan in 1909. The intelligence, sobriety, and self-restraint with which the subjects were discussed and the wishes of the people urged before the government, would have convinced any responsible Ruler, of the capacity of the Indians to manage their own affairs."... And he further continues, "I have known many a ryotwari-holder who did not know English, but who could discuss public questions with great ability and knowledge."

As regards the Popular Assembly of Travancore, he declares, "From the moment the Assembly was brought together, the keen interest

the members took in it, and the enthusiasm which, the very idea of people being consulted regarding the measures of Government, aroused in them, was a sight which would have rejoiced the heart of any well-wisher of his country. The Assembly has, in later years, afforded a striking proof of the aptitude of the people to share in the responsibilities of administration."

There is one more important feature of the Travancore Popular Assembly, which cannot be ignored, and which, therefore, certainly deserves mention. It is (1) *the rising above the crudest and the most offensive forms in the distinction of caste*, (2) *the disappearance of all credal prejudices*, and (3) *the absorption of all caste-bias in the political enthusiasm, love of liberty, and love of the country*, as appears evident from the matter-of-fact declarations of Mr. V. P. Mādhava Rāo himself. For, Says he, "The first meeting of the Assembly is instructive, as showing ...the influence (on the people) of ideas which are connected with their participation in the Councils of the Government.....There were Brāhmans, Nairs, Methans (as the local Mahomedans were called), and Syrian Christians, and other Christians, and Ilavas.....A Brāhman and a Nair, and Ilava and a Methan, and a Christian, were sitting side by side, and all were too eager to know what was going to happen,

to give any thought as to who the man seated next to them was. Thus, the untouchability of the Ilava was got over." "This, together with the movement which is in active operation throughout India for the elevation of the Depressed Classes should at once silence those who ignore the effect of political privileges in uplifting lower classes from a state of caste and social degradation."

Now, as regards the state of things in the territory of Baroda, equally reassuring and encouraging is the deliverance of Mr. V. P. Madhava Rao, a statesman and a practical man of business, who had risen from the position of a journalist and a clerk, to the highest rank of a Prime Minister of most important States in India. His pronouncements, therefore, deserve consideration, especially as he is certainly in no way to be deemed as one of those who have been derided, howsoever unjustly, either as agitators, or denounced as doctrinaires, and accused as political theorists.

When, therefore, such a statesman as Mr. V. P. Mâdhava Rao, of varied and continued observation, deems his countrymen, from personal experience, as having had the requisite capacity for Self-Government, his utterances in respect of this all important question, create in us a *faith* all the more unshaken, in our apti-

tude for managing our own affairs. In the circumstances, it will not be out of place to state here some of the obstacles, which, in the opinion of Mr. Mâdhava Râo, have stood in the way of our obtaining *Self-Government*, notwithstanding *our fitness* for the due discharge of duties appertaining to the responsible task. Says Mr. Mâdhava Rao :—

“The Bureaucracy has been tried, and been found wanting. We must now ask to be brought face to face with the British Democracy, who should take up our case and free us from the Rule of the Bureaucracy.”

“Great things were expected from the assumption of direct sovereignty by the Crown. But, the only result has been the growth of a powerful Bureaucracy, which no public opinion in the country can check, and over which no effective control is exercised by Parliament at home.”

“This Bureaucracy instead of forwarding the cause of Self-Government has put every obstacle in its way. It opposed the measures of Lord Ripon in regard to local Self-Government and equal treatment to Indians and Europeans, thirty five years ago. It opposed the Minto-Morley Reforms which gave extended powers to the Legislative Councils, both Imperial and

Provincial. Every effort to give a larger number of appointments in the higher grades of the service has been obstructed.”...

“Where is there scope for an Indian now, to rise to such distinguished positions under the Bureaucracy” (as the independent command of the Army or the rank of Governor)?...

“The fact is, the Bureaucracy will not allow full scope being given to the schemes of Self-Government even as they are”.

“So now, they (the British Nation) will have to replace the Bureaucracy by popular institutions, and entrust the administration to the people themselves, under the suzerainty of the British Nation”. (The Presidential Address. Madras Provincial Conference. 1917).

Chapter XIII.

Ancient Self-Government in the. East and the West.

A Comparison.

From the foregoing pages, the Reader will have formed some idea of the *polity* of Bhárata-Varsha or India, the foremost country in the East, nay in the world, that has claimed *Autonomy and Representative Government*, from hoary¹ times, or as Mr. Ansty would put it, from times as old as the East. (*Vide ante* p 22, and Chapters iii, vii, ix.)

1 (a) As, many Westerners have no idea of the immense extent of our antiquity, I respectfully beg to remind them that, when Europe was but a dense forest, fit only to afford retreat to savage life, we had even then enjoyed, during the long past, civilization and culture of an advanced type. (*Vide supra* p 31, and Gibbon's remarks quoted on p. 30).

(b) *Vide* Thornton's History of India and the posterity of Egypt, Babylonian, and Grecian civilization; *ante* p 101.

(c) Professor Bloomfield remarks that, "the language and literature of the Vedas is, by no means, so primitive as to place with it the real beginnings of Aryan life," and that, "this curtain, which seems to shut off our vision at 4500 B. C., may prove in the end a veil of thin gauze." (The 18th Anniversary of John Hopkin's University.)

(d) *Vide* also Mr. Halbed's observations, *ante* p. 276.
Foot-Note.

Moreover, the Reader perhaps remembers that there were even Republican Institutions in ancient India of the sixth and the seventh¹ centuries B. C., and of subsequent times, with either complete or modified independence, side by side with her great monarchies, as appears evident from our social condition of the period and the Buddhist records (ante *pp.* 154-161). He has also been aware that owing to the enormous extent of our colonies from Âryâvarta in olden times, to the North and the South, the East and the West (ante *p* 36), there was constant and uninterrupted communication between the East and the West ; and very probably, Egypt, Greece, Rome and other Western nations had borrowed their Social institutions and Republican ideas from Âryâvart (*pp* 88, 89, 90), whose Buddhist religion was preached in Greece and probably in Britain ; whose history and Government have gone into the dim and distant past (*pp* 19, 101), nay have reached the remotest early period, or say the Tertiary and the Glacial Epochs, which to a European mind, nurtured almost exclusively on Greece,¹

1 (a) I may here mention that "democracy or the Government of the Many, was yet (500 B. C.) unknown in Greece." The country was under the rule of the Despots or Tryants from 650-500 B. C., and "the really historical Period " (of the country) "is reached...somewhat before 500 B. C." (History of Greece. By Sir William Smith and G. E. Marindin, M. A. Edition 1900. *pp* 86, 11).

Italy, Egypt, as well as Palestine, and therefore accustomed to a more limited horizon, appears simply bewildering, not to say even fabulous and untrustworthy¹ (ante pp 28, 29, 34-37, 276, Foot- Note`.

But, facts are facts after all, and what was, at one time, deemed to be incredible, has been proved by modern scientific geological proof,² nay other sifted evidence, and historical criticism,³ to be true and above all suspicion.

(b) Italy was the parrot of Greece, and the beginnings of the Roman Republic may be seen from about 496 or 500 B. C. ; before which time, there was the reign of despotic kings, whose history has been almost enveloped and lost in thick legendary accounts. Nay, "the reigns of Romulus and Numa are in the realm of pure mythology." pp 66, 67. (History of Rome. By Henry, G. Liddell. D.D., and P.V.M. Benecke, M. A. Edition 1901).

1 Thus, while the history of Greece and Rome begins from 600-500 B. C., that of Āryāvart goes far beyond that of Egypt, Nineveh, Babylon, &c. Nay, even beyond 10,000 B. C., and the Glacial Epoch. (vide supra pp 100, 101, 31).

2 (a) *Vide* Geology and the Tertiary Man. Student's Lyell. Edited by Judd. 1896.

(b) The Vedic Fathers of Geology (pp 132-157), by the Author.

3 (a) M. Louis Jaccoliot's *La Bible Dans L' Inde*. pp vii, viii, ix. Edition 1870.

(b) Ancient History. By Cooke Taylor. (Edition 1854. p 526).

(c) Max Muller's *Science of Language*. Vol i. pp 268, 275, 276. 5th Edition.

(d) *India in Greece*. By Pococke. pp 12, 19, 26, 27. Edition 1856.

(e) Mr. Coleman. (Hindu Mythology).

Apart, however, from our Self-Government, Representative Institutions, and ancient Republics, there is yet another feature of our polity, which, owing to its immense importance, certainly deserves mention. This, I need hardly say, is our *Limited Monarchy* of yore. Obviously, the power of the King was actually limited by *the Will of the People* or the Nation's wishes, expressed in the Assembly, a fact frankly accepted as true, and unflinchingly admitted by foreigners and Anglo-Indians to be faithfully portrayed in the oldest archives of the world—the Rig-Veda. (Vide the Imperial Gazetteer of India. Vol. II. p 223. Edition 1908; ante p 273; and Chapter IX).

The King generally attended the meetings of these Institutions (ante p. 108), as they were

(f) Dr. Zerffi (Manual of Historical Development of Art).

(g) The Hindu Discovery of America. By the Hon Alexander Del Mar.

(h) The Times of India. Dated 1st October 1892.

(i) The Bombay Gazette. Dated 3rd October 1892.

(j) Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. xxv. p 637. 9th Edition.

(k) History of India. By Meadows Taylor. pp 50, 51. Edition 1894. Says Taylor: "Buddhism may have been preached in Britain, as it was in Greece." p 51.

(l) *Western Origin of the Early Chinese Civilization*. By Professor Terrien De Lacouperie.—Hindu Colonies in China.

(m) The Aryâvartie Home And Its Arctic Colonies. pp 379-428: By the Author.

considered to be of *divine origin*, and had, as such, a halo of sacredness about them (p. 127). Naturally, therefore, these institutions were always viewed with awe, and entitled to peculiar reverence. So much so, that during the discussions in the Assemblies, our apotheosized forefathers were always prayed for their guidance and assistance, nay even to see that no words or expressions were ever used by any speaker,¹ that were rough and rude, or wanting in courtesy and respect. (p. 132).

The decisions of the Assembly were final, and supposed to be *inviolable*. This fact, therefore, is very important in itself, and speaks volumes in respect of the power and authority of the Assembly (सभा). For, it contained *Representatives* of the people of all shades of thought, and their orders having been those of the Nation, they were considered conclusive, and were, as such, *inviolable* (नरिष्टा). *Vide supra p 129.*

Now, our ancient Self-Government and Representative Institutions, nay even our Republics, having yet been in an undeveloped state, were imperfect, and awaited improvement, in

1 This extreme care and caution on the part of our ancestors of yore, forcibly recall, by the way, to our mind the very sad occurrences, tumultuous scenes, and uncivil language used in the Political Assemblies and Parliaments of the West; where, in the heat of controversy, each political party wants to get the better of the other.

the very nature of things. However, there were, even then, *the three Estates of the Realm*, as at present in England, claimed by the Vedic and the Post-Vedic Empire, as follows:—(i) The Religious Congress or Assembly (*Vidatha*), (ii) the Village Community (*Samiti*), and (iii) the Popular Assembly (*Sabhā*). The first (*विदथ*) was for discussing religious, philosophical, and ceremonial queries; the second (*समिति*) for settling communal, economic, as well as rural disputes; and the third (*सभा*) for solving intricate questions of *National concern* (*pp* 47, 48). All these Assemblies had the sober heads of the nation, and contained, moreover, *Representatives* from each class or *Caste*, of which, by the bye, we shall speak later on, while comparing the three Estates of the Realm of England.

Thus, our Vedic Government, as pointed out before, was *constitutional*, and the Monarchy of the period was *limited*. For, the King, though he had ample powers, was not allowed to exceed due limits; and such of the despotic kings as had gone astray, had to reap the fruits of their misconduct and unpopularity. (*pp* 99, 152, 217). In addition to the religious binding, or the force of moral duty and fear of punishment, there was another check on our kings, which requires mention. This was *public opinion*, which had great effect on them, had much swayed their

conduct, and had ever exercised unbounded influence on the minds of the people of India. (vide chapter X above).

But, notwithstanding this *polity* of India of yore, notwithstanding her various forms of government, notwithstanding her past *Self-Government* and *Representative Institutions*, nay, notwithstanding her ancient *Republics* and *Limited Monarchies*, admitted as such by modern critics and Anglo-Indian writers (pp. 155-157, 273), the vanity of some Westerners would still assert itself at the expense of others, without even making the least inquiry in respect of the polity of the East, and without taking any cognizance whatever, of the forms of government that existed before in Ancient India or other countries, except the government of Israel, Sparta, Athens, Rome, and England. Because, it is argued that, “ *There was no curiosity about the institutions of other nations, about the origin of governments in general.*” Then goes on the boastful declaration thus:—“ *They (European nations) were the only communities in which the governed visibly took some share in the work of government. Outside the European system, as outside the Greek system, we have only the stereotyped uniformity of despotism, whether savage or civilized. The question of forms of government, therefore, belongs entirely to the European races.*” (Vide Ency-

clopædia Britannica. Ninth Edition. p 10.
The Italics in the extract are mine. The *Author*).

But, pray, what about the forms of Government that *existed in Ancient India, amongst our race of Indo-Aryans or the Hindus*, beyond the limits of Europe? Our Reader knows that India, the *primary seat of primitive civilization*, whence it had spread East and West, as admitted by oriental scholars and researchers of note (ante pp 36, 37, 89, 90), is an Asiatic country, and yet she had the privilege of enjoying the benefits of democratic Institutions,—Self-Government and Representative Assemblies, Limited Monarchy and Republics, at a time when all the ancient nations on Earth, (including even Egypt, Greece, and Rome, often too much lauded and raised to the skies p 297 Foot-notes), were either not yet born or were crawling on all the fours in dense forests, as observed by historians—Thornton and Gibbon (ante pp 30, 101) Probably, gross ignorance about India and enormous prejudice, want of curiosity and contempt¹ for

1 (a) Colonel Tod says, " A contempt for all that is Asiatic too often marks our countrymen in the East. "..... (Vide Tod's Annals of Rajasthan. Vol. I. pp 117, 118. Third Reprint. 1880).

(b) Sir Monier Williams likewise observes, " There seems too great a disposition among European scholars to regard the Hindus as destitute of all originality."...(Indian Wisdom. p 316. Edition 1875).

all that is Hindu or Asiatic, had come in the way of investigating forms of government, prevailing in the East, or say in India.

In short, those Westerners, who have had *no curiosity* about the origin of Governments of other people, or have had no admiration for the institutions of nations other than those of the favourite few, or say of Moses, Lycurgus, Solon, Numa, and Alfred, specified above (p 331), think more of their own institutions, and as such consider the Eastern system, or the ancient polity of India as "*stereotyped uniformity of despotism*," without taking the least trouble of going into the merits of her Self-Government, her Representative Institutions, her Republics, and her Limited Monarchy, of which the requisite details have been given in previous Chapters. (iii, iv, v, vii, ix.)

If then, our Eastern (Indo-Aryan) polity described before, has been dubbed "*stereotyped uniformity of despotism*," we are certainly at a loss to know by what name to call the extremely *autocratic rule* of some parts of the West; nay, even of some European races; of the Tyrants and the Democracy of Greece, whose "Governments" were said to be "essentially unstable," where "*the dread of tyranny was kept alive* by the facility with which an over-powerful and *unscrupulous citizen* could seize the whole *machinery of government*," where "communities

oscillated between some form of oligarchy and some form of democracy," where "*the security of each was constantly imperilled by the conspiracies of the opposing factions,*" and where, therefore, "the quality of persistent progress¹" was altogether absent; of the Republic of Rome, of which the dominant Patricians were not only the most exclusive, but were most oppressive creditors of the helpless Plebian debtors, whose (Republic's) hopeless state, or rather of the Senatorial party, was such that *all had become submissive* to the arbitrary Dictators, Consuls, or Proconsuls, who had *despotic command*, and who, having distinguished themselves as Conquerors, used to *exact* money from the unfortunate peoples, and even to *confiscate* lands belonging to others, *most arbitrarily*, not to say in a sweeping manner, *for satisfying the veterans and the greedy soldiery* eager for their promised rewards, where "*Liberty and independence were forgotten words,*" and where "*the constitution (was) falsely named Republican*"²; of the unconstitutional Monarchy of France, which was drenched in blood³, and

1. *Vide* Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. XI. p 11. Ninth Edition. The Italics in the extract are mine. (The Author).

2. *Vide* History of Rome. By Henry G. Liddell, D. D. and P. V. M. Benecke, M. A. New Edition, 1901, pp 81, 82, 701, 702, 714, 715, 719.

3. "The Empire" (History of England). Edition 1891, p 376.

where, after the French Revolution of 1789, there was the Reign of Terror, that lasted for more than a year; of the boundless despotism of Czar before the Russian Revolution in March 1917; and of democratic England, which, though a freedom-loving country, had protected, encouraged, and carried on Slave Trade from the reign of Queen Elizabeth upto 1833; of England which has not granted Home Rule yet to the Irish who are not only its next-door neighbours but its nearest kith and kin, nor to Indians,—an admittedly *great people of very ancient civilization*, endowed moreover with an *aptitude¹ for Self-government¹*, and yet groaning under the irresponsible² government of the Bureaucracy,

1. Lord Salisbury (in 1867, then Lord Cranborne and Secretary of State for India), in admitting our capacity for Self-government, observed thus :—.....“*It would be a great evil, if the result of our dominion was that the Natives of India who were capable of government should be absolutely and hopelessly excluded from such a career. The great advantage of the existence of Native States is that they afford an outlet for statesmanlike capacity such as has been alluded to.*” (*Hansard*. Vol. 185, p. 839).

2 (a) Vide ante pp. 323, 324.

(b) In this respect, Mr. Frederick John Shore, of the Bengal Civil Service, says as follows :—“But, the halcyon days of India, are over ; she has been drained of a large proportion of the wealth she once possessed, and her energies have been cramped by a sordid system of misrule to which the interests of millions have been sacrificed for the benefit of the few. The gradual impoverishment of the people and country, under the mode of rule established by

even after a century of British rule in India.

In these circumstances, I propose to give, in this Chapter, a few requisite and important particulars of the ancient as well as modern polity of the West, in view of enabling the Reader to compare this with that of the East, to remove every misapprehension and put an end to all prejudice caused by race or colour, to draw his own conclusions and see for himself, whether the balance is really in favour of the latter or the former.

I would, by the bye, take here the liberty to parenthetically state that, I have had to follow this course, as the tendency in some Westerners often asserts itself in overdrawing their own picture, and depreciating the deeds or

the British Government,.....the grinding extortions of the English Government, have effected the impoverishment of the Country and people to an extent almost unparalleled". "The fundamental principle of the English had been to make the whole Indian Nation subservient in every possible way to the interest and benefit of themselves."

(c) Sir George Wingate also (1859) says, as regards the nature of the rule, thus:—"Such is the nature of the tribute we have so long exacted from India,.....of the cruel crushing effect of the tribute upon India....." "The Indian tribute, whether weighed in the scale of justice, or viewed in the light of our interests, will be found at variance with humanity, with common sense, and with the received maxims of political science." (*Vide* Dr. Dādā Bhāi Naoroji's "Poverty and Un-British Rule in India." "Edition 1901, p. 617). .

minimising the virtues of others. This is amply borne out by the fact that even Lord Salisbury had had to admit the truth of the statement. Since, he said :—"The honorable gentleman (Mr. Laing) arguing in the strong official line seems to take the view that everything is right in British territory and every thing dark in Native territory." Although, "its (British) tendency to routine, its listless, heavy headlessness,.....produce an amount of inefficiency, which,.....creates a terrible amount of misery.".....On the other hand, "the simple form of Oriental Government will produce effects more satisfactory than the more elaborate system of English rule." (*Hansard*. Vol. 187, p. 1073).

In like manner, Sir Stafford Northcote, the Secretary of State for India, afterwards Lord Iddesleigh observed (24th May 1867) that, the English Government "ought to take a lesson from such circumstances.....It would be absurd in them to say that there was not a large fund of statesmanship and ability in the Indian character. They really must not be too proud. They were always ready to speak of the English Government as so infinitely superior to anything in the way of Indian Government. But, if the Natives of India were disposed to be equally critical, it would be possible for them to find out weak places in the harness of the

English administration".....(*Hansard*. Vol. 187, p. 1068).

While, Mr. Bright, in his speech in the Manchester Town Hall, made on 11th December 1877, thus declared :—"I say a (British) Government like that, has some fatal defect, which at some distant time must bring disaster and humiliation to the Government and to the people on whose behalf it rules."

Another statesman of ripe age, of great experience, of wide knowledge of the history of nations, and of mature judgment, also writes as follows :—"The object...is to show, on behalf of those who cannot answer for themselves, that they (Indians) are neither so black, nor we (Europeans) so white, as *we paint* them and ourselves,—that their government and institutions were *neither so defective, nor ours so perfect*, as we *assert* them to have been ; and that the "History of Indian Progress," which we create in bulky volumes, only means, after all, that the Christian Indian government of the nineteenth century is better than the Mahomedan and Hindu governments of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. This is the *extent of our pretensions*, and we can only support this claim *by depreciating the characters and doings of our predecessors*, and *exaggerating our own*, and after all leaving it much in doubt whether the

balance is really in our favour." (*Vide* "Poverty and Un-British Rule in India." By Dr. Dadabhai Nowroji. Edition 1901. p 614. The Italics are mine. *The Author*).

All this will speak for itself, and it is but fair to present to the Reader both the sides of the shield for purposes of comparison.

Beginning with India, we find that our Vedic Government thrived under the ægis of society which, though in a state of infancy, was full of life, had the robust spirit of independence, could participate in all its legitimate activities, and would show energy in the work undertaken. Its leaders also were very enthusiastic, had, moreover, keen intellect, were gifted with great penetration, and had all the qualifications required for leadership. They, therefore, had bestowed their best attention to the improvement and formation of their society, for the express purpose of social coherence and division of labour, as also for bringing within the fold of oneness the whole system. Nay, they had regulated the various grades with such profound skill, knit together the different elements with such signal success, and woven the several professions into the four castes of Brâhmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas, and Shudras, with such ingenuity, that they served to form a compact social body, and have been rightly supposed to

be but a civic organisation. For, the four classes were formed according to the merits, taste, and intellectual liking of each individual in the society. And though they seemed to be apparently separated, the one from the other, they were but fundamentally *closely united*, for all practical purposes. Since, the Brâhman ministered to the wants of the whole community, in matters that related to *religion* and *learning*. The Kshatriya looked after the *militia* and the *defence* of the country. The Vaishya took interest in the *growth of trade* or development of *commerce*, and left no stone unturned, in improving the condition of *agriculture*, producing abundant food-stuff for the population, and preserving fodder for cattle. While, the Shudra-class included the bulk of the people, and was intended for the *service* of the upper three classes, *owing to want of capacity in him* for any intellectual work.

For facility of reference, I venture to give the Vedic verse here below, as it gives but a *religious*, and solemn *sanction* to the Institution of Caste :—

ब्राह्मणोऽस्य मुखमासीद्वाङ्मनः राजन्यः कृतः ।

ऊरु तदस्य यद्वैश्यः पद्भ्यां शूद्रोऽजयत ॥

(ऋ० वे० १०-१०-१२).

The purport of this appears in an enigmatical form in the Rig-Veda (X. 90-12), but conveys the meaning expressed above,

Below the aforesaid four classes, we find mention made of other low tribes (*hīnajātayah-*हीनजातयः), and of persons following humble professions (*hīnashilpīni-*हीनशिल्पानि). All these, however, owing to our love of freedom, were reckoned as but *freemen*. Nay, even persons, captured during invasions in foreign territories and belonging to the enemies, were treated with much kindness, although deprived of liberty (*Jât.* 1-200; 1-220. *Vinaya* Texts, 1-191). For, they were considered *not as slaves*, but merely *as household servants*. Yet, their number was extremely small and even insignificant. Perhaps, it was on this account, that Megasthenes described India, as having had *no slaves at all*.

Here, it would certainly be most pertinent and worth our while to compare the mild treatment of the captives by us (Indians) with the harsh one of those in possession of the Greeks, the Romans, or the Christian slave-owners. And, as an independent testimony would be most acceptable to all, I beg to adduce it here. Says Rhys Davids: "...We hear nothing (in India) of such later developments of slavery as rendered the Greek mines, the Roman *latifundia*, or the plantations of Christian slave-owners, scenes of misery and oppression. For the most part, the slaves (in India) were household servants, and not badly treated; and their numbers seem to

have been insignificant." (Buddhist India, p 55. Edition 1903).

It seems that some Western nations, though they profess love of liberty and extension of franchise in their own case, do not keenly feel for the liberty and franchise of others, even though they be their own *kith* and *kin*, much less for slaves, as will be presently seen from the sufferings of the Helots and the slaves in Greece, of the Plebians and the slaves in Italy, of the Indians at the hands of England, and of the slaves possessed by Great Britain for carrying on Slave-Trade with Spanish Colonies, of which by the bye, we intend giving particulars in brief, later on, while describing the constitution and Government of those countries, for comparison with that of India in all their aspects.

Turning to our social coherence, we find that the Brâhmanic Caste-System was but a civic organism, formed for the express purpose of—

- (i) Securing Social Economy.
- (ii) Maintaining division of labour.
- (iii) Uniting separated elements in the several classes.
- (iv) Strengthening the mutual bonds existing in the society.
- (v) Duly appreciating and rightly recognising superb merits found in

any person belonging to the society, having had due regard to the equality of rights.

- (vi) Enabling any person of the lower class to raise himself in social rank, and enter the one immediately above it, not to say even the highest, if only he could show that he deserved it in every way, and thus,
- (vii) Eventually benefiting the Society, and the Nation at large.

I may here mention with advantage that, this scheme of social order, in no way ever terminated in mere speculation, nor was it in any way confined to theory only, but was actually brought into practice, as will be evident from the fact that the celebrated Rishi Vishvâmitra, though Kshatriya by birth, was raised to the dignity of a Brâhman, simply on account of his great merits; and Manu, our great Law-giver, has prominently recorded the same in his famous Code, owing to its extreme importance. Says he, " Even the son of Gâdhi (viz. Vishvâmitra) secured Brâhmanhood owing to his affability and obeisance."

...विनयात् ** प्राप्तवान् ** ब्राह्मण्यं चैव गाधिजः ॥

(मनुस्मृतिः ७. ४२).

Obviously, the Caste-system was organised in the interest of our Society at large. It being, therefore, an absolutely *self-less* task, there was never present to the mind of the framers of the scheme, the remotest motive of self-aggrandizement. And yet, there are those who would say otherwise, owing to prodigious ignorance and want of desire to dive deep into the matter, or to do justice to the system and its originators. That our Caste-system, with all its defects, (and what system in the world has no defects?) has innumerable advantages, goes without saying. And Western or Oriental critics too, have had to admit the fact. Nay, even Lord Sydenham, the ex-Governor of Bombay, has declared that "The Caste-system (of the Hindus) has some great advantages.".....(*Vide The Nineteenth Century And After*. December 1916. p 1125). While Justice Abdur Rahim emphatically says, "It is from a wrong and deceptive perspective that we are asked to look at the system of castes among the Hindus more as a dividing force than as a powerful binding factor." (*Vide Report of Lord Islington's Commission on the Public Services of India*. "Representation of the Masses." Paragraph 18).

In fact, our Brahminic Caste-order is but a systematic division of labour, an organised *Self-Government*, and a *self-acting social group* with

an inherent vitality. Mr. Baines, the Census Commissioner, had accordingly pointed out in the Census Report (1891. p. 182), that even great authorities have described Caste as *the express Badge of Hinduism*. While, M. Barth considers that, this institution is not merely *the symbol* of Hinduism, but is the very *strong-hold* of it, and a *religious factor of the very highest order*.

Nay, it involved an amount of *sacrifice* on the part of the Brâhman-originators of this most famous Socio religious scheme, and the Brâhmans had always before their eyes the very high ideal of *self-sacrifice*, not to say the extremely elevated notions of *self-restraint* and *self-culture*, as well. This has been borne out by the fact that, even occidental scholars of fame, and historians of note, have greatly appreciated the force, the character, and the achievements of the Brâhmanic system, especially as it presents a complete abnegation of Self, and places before the world a living institution, that has the principles of the division of labour ingeniously interwoven in it, for securing the interest of the country, and for devoting careful attention to the needs of the Nation at large.

Dr. Sir William Hunter, therefore, has rightly observed that, "the whole body of Sanskrit Literature bears witness to the fact that this (Brâhmanic) ideal-life was constantly before

their (Brahmans') eyes, and that it served to the whole caste as a high standard in its really essential features of *self-culture* and *self-restraint*."

"He (the Brāhman) is an example of a class becoming the ruling power in a country, not by force of arms, but by the vigour of *hereditary culture* and *temperance*. One race has swept across India after another, dynasties have risen and fallen, religions have spread themselves over the land and disappeared. But, since the dawn of history, the Brāhman has calmly ruled, swaying the minds and *receiving the homage of the people*, and *accepted by foreign nations as the highest type of Indian Mankind*."

"The paramount position which the Brāhmans won, resulted in no small measure from the benefits which they bestowed. For their own Aryan countrymen, they developed a noble language and literature. The Brahmanas were not only the priests and philosophers. They were also the law-givers, the statesmen, the administrators, the men of Science, and the Poets of their race." (Indian Empire. pp. 96,97. Second Edition. The Italics in the quotation are mine. The Author.)

These achievements of our Caste-system which infuses hereditary culture and self-sacrifice, are not only the things of the past, but exhibit equally bright phenomena, even during the present times. For instance, the Brahman

Colleges called Tols, the Gurukula College, the Shānti Niketana College, the National College, the Hindu College, the Fergusson College, the New College, and many other institutions of the type, have been conducted on the same principle of *self-sacrifice*, *self-restraint*, and *self-culture*. The Honourable Mr. Surendranath Banerjee of Calcutta, therefore, while addressing the students of Poona, on the 30th of December 1895, observed thus :—" The noble dignity that attends the profession of a teacher who is the model of our lives.....must be so in this great historical city (Poona). When, you have in that Fergusson College the *monument of undying self-sacrifice* (cheers); when, you have it as a *monument of the devoted and self-denying efforts* of men who have dedicated the best years of their lives to the *up-building* of that Institution (cheers). Young men, *where can you have better examples of devotion, sacrifice, and courage*, than in the lives of Professor Gokhale, (hear, hear, and cheers), or of that illustrious man now dead and gone, whose memory you adore and I respect, of the late Principal Apte (cheers)...? I should like to present this pattern of *self-sacrifice* in the cause of duty, for the imitation of these young men."

Thus, our Caste-system, that has secured from time immemorial the most sacred sanction

of the Vedas (Rig-Veda X. 90), having had an organic vitality, has been ever self-acting, and formed very naturally *a tower of strength*, not only in matters of religion, but also in social concerns, communal interests, and self-government. Accordingly, Dr. Machichan, Principal of the Wilson College, Bombay, says that "*the strength and influence of Hinduism are to be found in that great socio-religious organisation, which is conveniently described as the System of Caste.*" (*Vide Education as a Missionary Agency. A paper read by the Doctor in the Decennial-Conference, on the 2nd of January 1892*).

Moreover, Mrs. Anne Besant enthusiastically declares that, "It was her (India's) mighty religion that formed her claim to greatness amongst the world's people. Rome had passed and left her ruins; and Greece had passed and left her literature. India older than Greece or Rome,—India that was old before Egypt was born,—India that was ancient before Chaldæa was dreamed of,—India that went back thousands of centuries before Persia had come to the front,—India was *still a living nation*, when the nations of the past were dead, and their dust had vanished from the surface of the globe. Why was it that amongst such ancient civilization, *her's alone was living at the present day*? Why was it that amongst so many ruins, India had still a future, as well

as the memory of the past? In the history of the world, India lived because India's was the spirit of humanity, which could not die. She was the earliest of the Aryan peoples, the first born of the mightiest races." (India and its Mission. Lecture delivered in Bombay, in January 1894).

Now, our Brāhmanic Caste-System is the oldest¹ in the world, having been organised in the Rig-Vedic period. The four castes or classes served as but a powerful binding factor, and these, in the very nature of things, were obviously understood and meant to represent not only the interest of every class or caste, but also the interest of the nation, as the same was

1. The reference to the four castes appears in the 90th hymn of the tenth *Mandala* of the Rig-Veda, and to the first two classes of Brahmins and Kshatriyas (ऋषि राजानि), even earlier still, in the Rig-Veda (I. 108.7).

Dr. Haugh calls " this passage " "the most ancient and authoritative," "on the origin of Brahmanism and caste", in general. *Vide* Dr. Haugh's Tract, on the "Origin of Brahmanism". 1863.p4).

In like manner, Dr. Kern maintains that, "In truth, if any thing is plain in the whole poem, it is this that in the estimation of the author, the division into classes was as old as the sun and the moon, as Indra and Agni, as the horse and the cow, in short, as old as the creation." *Vide* Dr. Kern's Dissertation in respect of the antiquity of Castes, read before the Royal Academy of Sciences, at Amsterdam, on the 13th of March 1871).

involved in all sorts of avocations, appertaining to the class or caste.

In short, our Caste-system, which, in the long run, had a political bearing on our society, was primarily the basis of the *division of labour*, in which the distribution of work was made with great tact and wisdom, according to the fitness and capacity of each individual (ante pp 339, 340). In this, however, were involved varied interests and complex functions of each class, and these required very careful attention, as they related to Religion, Social matters, Communal interests, and National concerns. It was, therefore, thought proper to organize three different institutions, for discussing special subjects therein, in the presence of the Representatives of each class. These were known as follows :—

(i) The Religious Congress, called the Sacrificial Assembly or *Vidatha*,

(ii) The Village Commune or *Samiti*, and

(iii) The Popular Assembly or *Sabha*.

Of these, we have given the necessary details before (pp 47, 48, 50, 92, 93) ; and it will appear from them that, the Village Commune or *the well-known Village Community* of India, is the direct outcome of the Brahmanic system of Caste, and has left a permanent mark in the country, notwithstanding countless revolutions,

and numberless changes in the dynasties, from time to time.

Obviously, these were the basis of our Brahmanic polity. These formed the nucleus of our Vedic and Post-Vedic *Self-Government*. These contained the germs of our *primitive mode of Representation* (supra pp. 93,94). And these gradually developed themselves everywhere, in form and scope, as appears evident from the matter-of-fact particulars given before (*Vide ante pp. 171-175, 186, 187*). These had evolved not only Sovereignty, but also Constitutional Government, as also Limited Monarchy (ante pp 99,109), of which we shall give further details later on, in view of enabling the Reader to compare our ideas in respect of them, with those of the West, after making a passing reference to the *Castes* or *Classes* of ancient Egypt, Greece, and Rome, for the purpose of placing them side by side, and making comparison with the Caste-System of India, just described, as the same will be found interesting from many standpoints, chiefly religious, social, or political. Beginning with Egypt, which, as stated before [ante p 297. Foot-note (a)], *was an entire Indian emanation* or our Hindu colony from India, we find that, like us (Hindus), it had also caste-institutions which resembled our caste-system,

Evidently, Egypt having been our colony, the Egyptians had, it seems, in the very nature of things, received their civilization and even the caste-system from the Hindus. And it is for this reason that Dr. Cooke Taylor has, in his "Ancient History", written to the effect that, "the Egyptians may have derived their system of civilization from the Hindus," as "has indeed been conjectured"; "and there are, doubtless, many striking analogies between the institutions of both nations." "There is certainly evidence of small colonies having come from the mouth of the Indus to the shores of Africa, and penetrated thence to the Nile, south of the Egyptian frontiers."... "The institution of castes,...this (Egyptian) nation had in common with the Hindus. The priests and warriors were the most honourable : next to them ranked the agriculturists, the merchants, and mariners, and the artisans,...the lowest caste was that of the shepherds," and "every shepherd was an abomination to the Egyptians." (*Vide* "Manual of Ancient History." Sixth Edition. pp. 11,12).

Besides, Herodotus,¹ who is the first that has given us a Catalogue of Egyptian kings, mentions Menes as *the first man* who reigned in Egypt, informing us to say that, he (king

1. Cooke Taylor's "Ancient History." p 527. Sixth Edition 1854.

Menes) was succeeded by a number of kings, followed by nineteen Ethiopian sovereigns, indicating thereby that the Ethiopian rulers of Egypt were preceded by kings of the line of Menes (Hindu Manu), the founder of the Egyptian Empire. While Diodorus Seculus also confirms the fact of Menes having been the first ruler of Egypt.

Apart, however, from the above historical information, the laborious researches of Mr. A. Curzon, as also his most searching investigations, yield important results. For, they not only *establish the Hindu origin* of the old Egyptian civilization from all stand-points, but prove, moreover, that ancient Egypt was but a Hindu¹ Colony from Âryâvarta, whose warriors, after effecting expulsion of the shepherd kings—the Hyksos, and conquering the country, had colonized and ruled it, as appears manifest from the names of kings such as Menes and Ramasses, which obviously are the corrupt forms of

1. As some difference of opinion exists as regards the origin of the word Hindu and Hindusthan, I think it desirable here to clear the point, by placing before the Reader an authoritative text.

Swami Mangal Nathji, who is an old revered Sanyâsi and a Sanskrit Scholar, residing at Rishikesh, gives us to understand that he had come across the text quoted below, in a manuscript-copy of the ancient Purâna known as Brihan-nâradi (बृहन्नारदी), which he happened to see with a Pandit

Sanskrit Manus (मनुः) and Râmas (रामः), borne by several kings of Egypt, which had then become a province of Âryâvarta. If this Râmas

of Shâm village (of Shâm Choryasi group) in the Hushiar. pur District of the Panjab. The text also seems to be quoted independently, by a Bengali author of a book called Brah-mânda Vrittânta (ब्रह्माण्ड वृत्तान्त), and runs as follows :—

हिमालयं समारम्य यावद्विन्दुसरोवरम् ।
हिन्दुस्थानमिति ख्यातमायन्ताक्षरयोगतः ॥

This, when freely translated into English, means that the country lying between the *Himalaya* Mountain and the *Bindu-Sarocara* (meaning the Cape Comorin Sea), is known as Hindusthan, by combination of the first letter (H) of Himalaya, and the last compound letter ण्ड (ndu) of the word *Bindu*.

In this way, the word Hindu (हिन्दु) has been formed from the two words (हिमालयं+विन्दुसरोवरं); and this practice of forming words by abbreviated combinations obtains not only in this country or in Sanskrit, but also in other countries and languages.

Obviously, no ignominy or disrespect attaches to the word Hindu, in any way whatever. Nay, it serves as a *Religious Standard* to rally round, and a trumpet call to all those who follow Hindu faith, or the religion of Indian origin. As such, therefore, it is an all-important asset of *national value*.

Moreover, the word Hindu has been explained in another way, and this has still greater value, as has been stated to have been described in the Ramakosha :—

हिन्दुर्दण्डनुहा प्रोक्तोऽनार्यनीतिविद्वेषिकः ।
सद्धर्मपालको विद्वान् औतधर्मपरायणः ॥

“He is called Hindu who destroys the wicked, and is opposed to non-Aryan practices; who supports the true religion, is learned, and follows the injunctions of the Vedas.”

was Ramasses the Great, called also Sethos or Sesostris, he was certainly a great conqueror, and the most celebrated of the Egyptian monarchs.

In this connection, therefore, the testimony of Mr. Curzon would be most valuable and interesting. Says he :—...“ I have long considered as next to certain that the Menes of the Egyptians and Manu, (anciently Manus) of the Hindus, refer to an historical personage—an Aryan Chief—who first invaded and conquered Egypt from India. And I think this event is the earliest well defined instance of the migrations of the Aryans westward.....That Egyptian civilization was not originally indigenous in Egypt can be deduced from several circumstances. The Egyptians were always an isolated people in Africa, their contiguous neighbours of the west and south being all of a race—the negro, the true aboriginal race of that continent—entirely different from themselves. Egypt, on the invasions of Menes, appears to have been inhabited by the Negro race. The valley of the Nile was too restricted in extent to be the nursery of the various and powerful Aryan nations, who have played so important a part in universal history. The Egyptians have but one Menes who, they admit, was the founder of their Empire. It is now ascertained from

the monuments, that this Menes was, with respect to Egypt itself, a foreign invader and conqueror. The Hindus have had, at least, seven personages of this name, whose memorials, as preserved in Sanskrit works, are sufficiently satisfactory to relate to real actors.".....

In like manner, continues Mr. Curzon, "the name of Ramas or Ramasses borne by several kings of Egypt is certainly the Sanskrit रामस्, a genuine Hindu appellation." But, neither should this Manu (Egyptian Menes) be confounded with Manu Vaivasvata (मनुवैवस्वत) nor with Manu (मनु) the Lawgiver, nor Râma (Egyptian Ramasses) with the Dâsharathi Râma, Parashu-Râma, and Bala Râma, any more than the Henries—kings of England with the Henries of France. (*Vide* Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland. Vol. XVI. May 1854. Part, II pp 199, 200).

As in Âryâvarta, so in Egypt, the religion and government were also interdependent and intimately blended, during the Hindu rule of Egypt. The priestly class was in the forefront in all important matters. The belief in the transmigration of souls was certainly imported from Âryâvarta. Agriculture, trades, and professions were hereditary, as exclusive dedication of families to separate employments ensured perfection in the arts. Women were honoured as

in Ancient India (पूजाहोमृहदीप्तयः । स्त्रियः श्रियश्च
गेहेषु ॥ म. स्मृ. ९. २६), and respect was paid
to old age and rank. (Cooke Taylor's Ancient
History, pp. 17-19. Sixth Edition).

Thus, the Egyptian nation, the oldest of the
Western world, having had its civilization, gov-
ernment, as also social, literary, religious, and
Caste-Institutions, derived from Âryâvarta and
her great Hindu warriors, its polity and religion,
the worship of the bull or cow, were essentially
Indo-Aryan or Hindu, already described in the
preceding pages. This Hindu polity of Egypt
continued, I need hardly say, till its subjugation
by Ethiopian Monarchs.

We shall now direct our attention for a while
to the polity of Moses, the Prophet and the leader
of the Israelites, and see whether it gives us any
solid facts.

The constitution given to the Israelites—the
chosen people of God, after their expulsion from
Egypt in B. c. 1491, during the reign of Pha-
raoh, has been described to be theocracy, in which
Moses is said to have received from the Lord the
sacred Code of laws, by which they were to be
governed. The daughter of the Egyptian king
Pharaoh, named Thermutis or Merris had taken
pretty good care to have Moses trained in all the
wisdom of Egypt, owing probably to his fascina-
ting beauty, to which had also to be added his

great intellectual endowments. But with all this, beyond miracles, there appears nothing which can afford any idea in respect of the administrative talents or the governing capacity of Moses. Besides, we are surprised to see the extreme wrath of Moses, under the influence of which, "he broke the tables of stone on which the Ten Commandments had been graven by the (very) finger of God." While, the tribe of Levi, slew three thousand of the Israelites, for no fault of their's whatever, other than this that they venerated and worshipped a golden calf, or representation of a bull. The massacre was perpetrated under the very nose of Moses, and even when Aaron his brother, who had accompanied him to Mount Sinai, had "consented," nay had himself melted down the golden ornaments brought from Egypt, and had also formed a calf of gold so melted, as an object of worship. (Vide Cooke Taylor's Ancient History. Edition 1854. pp 83-86 ; Encyclopaedia Britannica. Edition Ninth. Vol XVI. pp 860, 861).

Moreover, the wrath of Moses which caused him to break down the tables containing the Lord's Ten Commandments, the appalling massacre of three thousand persons, the open hostilities and acts of rebellion of the Israelites against Moses-the prophet and their leader, the curse of forty years of wandering

in the desert for expiating crime said to be national, the sedition again of the Israelites, and the ineffectual remonstrances of Moses, all these do not at all give us any redeeming feature, or present a favourable view, of the polity of Moses.

Turning to Greece, we find that, like Egypt, this country also had the Institutions of Caste, or Social order. Since, we see the Greeks divided into three classes, viz. (1) Nobles, (2) Freemen, and (3) Slaves. The Ionians or Attic tribes, however, were distributed into four classess, such as (*a*) Geleontes—the bright or illustrious, (*b*) Hopletes—the warrior class, (*c*) Argades—the artisans, and (*d*) Aegicores or goat herds. This Attic distribution seems to be a copy of the Hindu original. (Vide ante *p* 340).

The nobles of Greece or persons belonging to the first class, were in possession of large estates. The Freemen, that belonged to the second class, were of two kinds. (*a*) Those who owned bits of land which they themselves cultivated, and (*b*) those who having had no land of their's, worked for hire on the estates of others. These were called Thetes. While Slaves, who were of the third class, were persons either captured in war, or bought from pirates. As pointed out before, the treatment of these slaves by the Greek

owners was very harsh and far from satisfactory. (ante *pp* 341, 342).

Moreover, even from other instances, there seems to be a very low regard amongst the ancient Greeks, for moral principles and rectitude of conduct. For, says the historian, "And they (the Spartans) were encouraged to add to it (their allowance of food), even by stealing ; but if they were caught in the theft, they were punished for their want of dexterity. Plutarch tells us of a boy, who having stolen a fox, and hidden it under his garment, chose rather to let it tear out his very bowels than betray his theft." (Sir William Smith's History of Greece. New Edition, 1900. *p* 75). Now, this was obviously a part and parcel of the legislation of Lycurgus. And if such a thing as this, that was most revolting to the moral sense on the very face of it, was allowed by him, who was not only a strict disciplinarian but also a Law-giver, that had introduced it into his Code of rules framed for the guidance of the nation, then certainly it indicates a degenerate moral state of the society.

The Freeman, like the Slaves, were always oppressed and extremely neglected; and even the Helots, though they were of pure Hellenic blood, of the same race, and spoke the

same language as their masters, were reduced to serfdom. Nay, the most revolting breach of trust, and the detestable massacre of 2000 innocent Helots, even after solemn promise of giving them liberty and even selecting them as worthy of emancipation, because of their distinguished services in war, was of no consequence at all to the Grecians (424 B.C.). This reminds us of the lawless condition of the Grecian society, during the time of Homer. For, says the historian, "The Poems of Homer represent a state of society, in which the protection of law is practically unknown. The chief who cannot defend himself is plundered and maltreated by his more powerful neighbour." In short, "the poet ascribes to his greatest heroes savage brutalities." (Vide Dr. Sir William Smith's History of Greece. New Edition, 1900, p 33).

Probably, we find history repeating itself, even in the fifth century B. C., as there was no protection of law, nor respect for promises given, nor security of life. Nay, solemn promises made in public, were broken with impunity, and massacres of the innocent were unhasitatingly allowed, without a word of protest or remorse. Says the historian, "among the horrors which the great historian of the Peloponnesian war has noted, as characterising the times, the murder of 2000 Helots by the Lacedaemonians (424 B.C.), stand

conspicuous."... "The Lacedaemonians, about this time, proclaimed that those Helots who had distinguished themselves by their services during the war should come forward and claim their liberty. A large body appeared, out of whom 2000 were selected as worthy of emancipation. Crowned with garlands, and honoured with all the imposing ceremonies of religion, the unhappy Helots paid with their lives for the liberty thus solemnly conferred." (*Vide* Dr. Sir Wm. Smith's History of Greece, Edition 1900, p 327).

In fact, as the Historian¹ of Greece tells us, "the life of the poorer classes (in Greece) was a somewhat depressed and joyless one." "Might¹ often made right, and they lived in the midst of wars. Pirates were under no restraint, and piracy was not regarded as a discredit any more than cattle-lifting in old times on Scotch border."

In Italy too, the same state of things appears to have prevailed. For, while the Roman burgesses or Patricians enjoyed full power, and engrossed all political rights, the poor clients or Dependents were at their mercy, and had no place in the state at all. Nay, even the Plebians, who possessed wealth, who were numbered among the Patrician families, who had be-

1 Sir William Smith. D. C. L., L. L. D.'s History of Greece. New Edition 1900, p 34.

come part and parcel of the *Populus* or Body Politic of Rome, and had also held land, were reduced to the greatest distress, and had to submit, at all times, to the state of social and political inferiority. The laws of debtor and creditor were very severe, and these had often forced the Plebians to seek relief, in the way of claiming to be recognised as members of the body politic, by all means in their power, and even by finally taking recourse to *Secessions*, for not less than five times, during a period of 208 years, from the first Secession in B. C. 494, for renewed breach of faith by the Patricians, till the fifth and the last Secession in B. C. 286.

Like the Greeks, the Romans also possessed slaves, who had the misfortune of being conquered by the warriors of Italy. But, the worst feature of this institution of slaves and of the slave-trade then actually going on, was that all the conquered peoples were regarded in the light of booty, as completely as cattle or lifeless goods, nay even to such an extent that no pain or suffering inflicted on a slave was deemed punishable, unless loss thereby accrued to the owner. Moreover, agricultural slaves were treated as mere cattle; and the Romans generally showed no sympathy whatever even in the case of slaves who had spent their lives in cultivating their masters' lands. This sort of oppression en-

gendered extreme discontent, and the refusal of a slave-owner, to supply his slaves with clothes, and his reply to the slaves, "What?" "Are there no travellers with clothes on?" turned these slaves into a banditti of robbers, who successfully raised the standard of revolt, and kept the Roman soldiers at bay for sometime, in the two Slave-Wars in Sicily.

Thus, whether, in Greece or in Italy, all the growing ill-feeling, the heart-rending oppression, and consequent seething discontent, in the lower classes, had their fruitful source in the very organism of the Greek and Roman society, as it encouraged and vehemently maintained, even from its inception, the most pernicious, corrosive, and even ruinous principle of "*All for self, and nothing at all for helpless others, except the crumbs,*" or the old Senatorial rule of "Every man for himself." (Liddell's History of Rome, p. 719). Obviously, this having actually been the case, and the interest of only the uppermost class or of the Aristocracy having ever been present to the mind, this class only was always consulted or cared for, in all actions of the State, to the utter exclusion and disregard of that of the lower orders of the society, which formed the bulk of the Nation.

For instance, the Nobles of Greece and the Patricians of Italy, or say the Aristocracy of both these countries, always treated the lower classes with contempt, and assuming an air of

superiority, deemed these as their inferiors. This distressing inequality kept the lower orders in such a miserable plight and pitiable condition, that they ever thought that life was not worth living. In fact, barring a few bright instances, such as Lycurgus, Solon, and others of Greece, or Valerius, Horatius, and others of Italy, the total absence of any the least desire for justice, for equality of rights, for fair play, and for a just apportionment of political privileges or of things, even in matters of social position, was the most painful feature of the Greek and Roman polity, not to say even of their social life; to which must also be added the most cruel and inhuman treatment of slaves. Obviously, all these manifold causes tended to produce, severally or in combination, the result, both in Greece and Italy, which I venture to sum up separately of each, in brief, as follows:—

The Government of Greece, as one may at once perceive, had no stability at all. For, we find the Monarchy of the heroic times, giving place to an Oligarchy or Aristocracy. This again, having exercised its authority arbitrarily, had caused discontent of the people. It was, therefore, abolished, and Tyrants or Despots had usurped its place. The government of these irresponsible rulers was extremely oppressive and cruel; and yet, it lasted for one hundred and fifty

years (B. C. 650-500). Afterwards, it was replaced by Democracy, which was unknown in Greece uptil B. C. 500. After its establishment, it lasted only for 89 years, giving place to Oligarchy in 411 B. C., and again in 404 B. C., after the fall of Athens. Obviously, each of these forms of Government was always in danger, and no one knew when any of them would be overthrown and replaced by the other. Moreover, each Grecian State had its Monarchy, Oligarchy, or Democracy, and there was no National form of Government.

This probably, was the direct outcome of Greek jealousy and enmity, fickleness and haughty bearing, heterogeneous elements, and want of coherence in the country, its cruel conduct and extreme contempt for others, its much injustice and uncontrollable desire for self-aggrandizement, even at the sacrifice of common weal or national cause, over-confidence and self-conceit, to which latter vice, a very pointed reference has been made, even by the reputed historian Ockley. (*Vide ante pp 33, 34*). To quote a Western authority, " The dread of tyranny (in Greece) was kept alive by the facility with which an ever powerful and unscrupulous citizen could seize the whole machinery of government. Communities oscillated between some form of oligarchy and some form of democracy. The security of each

was constantly imperilled by the conspiracies of the opposing factions. Hence, although political life exhibits that exuberant variety of form and expression which characterises all the intellectual products of Greece, it lacks the quality of persistent progress. Then there was no approximation to a national government even of the federal type." (*Vide* Encyclopædia Britannica. Ninth Edition, p. 11).

In like manner, in the history of Rome also, or rather that of ancient Italy, we find the same predominance of self-interest, the same absence of any high sentiment of moral feeling, of rectitude of conduct, of due regard for promises made, and of the great moral principles involved therein. And whether in Monarchy or Patrician Oligarchy, in Roman Republic or Imperial Despotism, we find the same characteristic moral defect prevailing every where, from first to last. Monarchy had commenced from Romulus, the first king of Rome (753 B. C.), and he had taken some wise precautions for peopling the city which he had built. By his tact and skilful measures, men were supplied in plenty. They, however, lacked wives, and none of the neighbouring cities would offer its daughters in marriage to them. "Romulus, therefore, determined (most-cowardly) to compass by foul means what he could not obtain by fair, " by treacherously inviting " the people of

the Sabines and neighbouring Latin towns to witness.....games to be celebrated in honour of the god Consus; and when they were intent upon the show, a number of Roman¹ youths

1 This act was doubtless most disgraceful, nay in no way chivalrous, and therefore not at all becoming a king. And yet, without even so much as a word of censure passed to condemn it, Western historians call it as "the famous Rape of the Sabine Women." (*Vide* Liddell's History of Rome. New Edition. 1901. p 12).

We have already noticed the treachery of Greece (*ante* p 361), and Italy was not less adept nor less trained, in the diabolical art of breach of faith and hypocrisy. For, says the historian, "Diplomatic arts of the basest kind were becoming part of the profession of Senator. The rude simplicity of the old Roman character was degenerating into brutal arrogance, or was used as a cloak for the meanest and most hypocritical ends." p 395.

"It is grievous to have to relate such an act of (and the shocking deed done by) Aemilius Paullus. It may be imagined what must have been the public feeling of a nation (during the massacre in Epirus) when the government (of Rome) could deliberately issue such an order,^o when the best of its citizens thought himself bound to execute it without hesitation or reserve, when no historian speaks of it with so much as a word of censure" p 415.

Equally revolting is the treacherous and inhuman rape of Lucretia, the conduct of the Romans in respect of Carthage even after its humiliating submission, the perfidy of Servilius Caepio, the treachery of Galba and Lucullus, the cutting into pieces by the former of 7000 Lusitanians, the shameless lust of Appius Claudius in the matter of Virginia, and the behaviour of the Decemvirs in causing the death of the brave soldier Siccus Dentatus. (*Vide* History of Rome. By Dr. Henry Liddell. New Edition 1901. pp 54, 436, 446, 425, 108, 107).

^o The Roman Senate had commanded to have the sack of gold, silver, and precious metals of seventy towns of

(treacherously) rushed in, and seized all the marriagaeable maidens on whom they could lay hands. " (*Vide* History of Rome. By Henry G. Liddell. D. D. New Edition. 1901. p 22).

The aforesaid act was certainly most *infamous* and *dishonourable*, viz, the Rape of the Sabine Women; and yet it has been called " the famous Rape of the Sabine Women. " It was especially the aggravated crime, and the heinous deed was perpetrated in a cowardly way, under the very nose and with the consent of the king. Very naturally, therefore, the perents and kinsfolk of the ravished maidens had taken up arms, to avenge the insult they had received. The fact, therefore, that even the very head and front of the people, whose first and sacred duty it was to protect the *women's honour* in a most chivalrous manner, should have himself stooped, thus cowardly and treacherously, to perpetrate the crime of sullyng their honour, betrays a very degenerate state of morals of the society, of the country, and of the times.

Says the historian, " It is needless here to repeat the dismal tale of corruption and vice which was presented in the life of most of the eminent Romans of the time"....."Nothing more strongly proves the vicious state of society

Epirus, by seizing them along with all their free inhabitants, and demolishing the walls of each of the towns.

than the neglect of the marriage tie and the unblushing immorality of the female-sex."..... " p 736.

"A sure sign of corruption appears in the dissolute manners that were discovered among the women. In 186 B. C., the Consul Postumius was accidentally informed that there were, not only in Rome but in many Italian towns, secret societies in which young men and women were dedicated to Bacchus ; and that under the cloak of religious ceremonies, every kind of license and debauchery was practised." pp 396, 397.

This state of things having transgressed the extreme limits of decency, "The Senate issued a stringent decree for the repression of Bacchanalian orgies. Numbers of men were put to death ; the women were handed over to the heads of their respective families. For, the law did not permit the public execution of a female." p 397.

Had it not been for the law, the women also would have been put to death like men. Because, such was the most detestable, ugly, and revolting nature of the crime that they had committed.

And we have been actually told that, "A few years later, Piso, the Consul for 180 B. C., died suddenly. His wife was accused of poisoning him. It was believed that this was a not uncommon practice. Whatever was the truth, it

is clear that such crimes would hardly have been imputed to Roman matrons, if their lives had not given some colour to the charge." pp 397, 398. (*Vide History of Rome. By Dr. Henry G. Liddell. New edition. 1901*).

Probably, by the *unprovoked criminal assault* on the Sabine women, and *the most infamous Rape of the innocent Virgins*, a very bad example was set by Romulus—the first ruler of Rome, to his subjects and the people. Naturally, therefore, the seed thus sown was but bearing the like fruit.

The Monarchy thus commenced by Romulus, was in time replaced by a Patrician Oligarchy (B.C. 510), which again had to make room for a Limited Republic and an Oligarchy of wealth. Then, after a century of civil war that had shaken the State and the country from one extremity to the other, there was *absolute* Despotism (B.C. 48), for which, it seems, the Roman Oligarchy had long been preparing. Since, it evidently appears that despotic powers were conferred by the Senate (whose only redeeming feature was capacity and experience) on individuals, for some set purpose, and for a definite period; while, the general tendency of events had thrown power into the hands of successful generals. Obviously, there were great evils resulting from such a course,

and these had to be prevented by more or less forcible means.

In short, the subsequent history of Rome presents but a personal conflict for supreme power, Despotism, or Imperial rule, in place of "the Constitution falsely named Republican." Naturally enough, we find that every man was for himself; and owing to the greed of power, corruption of the age, reckless self-indulgence, want of prudence, as also constant wars, "Liberty and independence were forgotten words." Or, in the words of a Western critic, "The outward forms of Republican Government remained, but one man united in his own person all the leading offices, and used them to give a seemingly legal title to what was essentially military despotism." "Henceforward, free government, all over the world, lay crushed beneath the military despotism of Rome.....Rival Emperors were elected by different armies; and nothing less than the force of arms could decide the question between them." (*Vide* Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. XI. p 11. Ninth Edition).

So much then as regards the Greek and Roman polity, and even of the Greek and Roman Castes, otherwise known as classes or tribes, into which Greece and Italy were primarily divided, and which, moreover, had a peculiar bearing on the polity of the two countries. These, though they

have left undying monuments of their intellect and literature, oration and art, have hardly exhibited that noble self-sacrifice and *moral elevation*, which sway the minds and receive the homage of the people (*Vide supra p 346*), but have, on the contrary, ever presented to our view the degenerate love of self-aggrandizement, self-indulgence, and self-interest (*pp 368-372*).

Along with the Greek and Roman polity and caste divisions, the Brâhmanical polity and Caste-system have also been described in detail (*pp 339-350*). It would, therefore, be but opportune to cast a glance at them, and compare these with those of Greece and Rome.

As the reader is aware, Hindu India, the most ancient country and the very type of the East, has been divided from time immemorial into four castes (*ante p 339*). While, Greece and Italy were generally divided each into three divisions, excepting the Ionian Greeks, who were, like us Hindus, distributed into four classes. These existed in Attica from the earliest period, and were in full swing down to the times of Cleisthenes (B.C. 510); when, some new reforms were introduced in the social system and polity of Athens. The four Attic tribes had their source in the rank and occupation of their members, and as such, greatly resembled, with a little dif-

ference, the Caste-system of the Brâhmans. (*Vide ante pp 339, 340, 359*).

Probably, the four Attic tribes were the vestiges of the Vedic and pre-historic Brâhmanic colonies in Greece and elsewhere during the hoary period, when our ancestors, after their emigrations from Âryâvarta, had scattered every where, either while on their way to the Arctic for colonizing that region, or on their return-journey Home to Âryâvarta, after the Advent of the Great Ice-Age, when the northern parts of Europe having been buried under the thick sheets of Ice and snow, our colonists in the Arctic had to flee and take shelter wherever they could find it. (*Vide The Author's "Âryâvartic Home and its Arctic Colonies," Ch. XIV ; see also Pococke's' "India in Greece." Ed. 1856. p 12*).

Be that as it may, one thing is certain more than another, that caste or the social system and the polity of the Hindus, having had the elevating spirit of humanity, which, endowed with complete *abnegation of self*, was yet saturated with the most ardent desire to *secure common weal* and the *interests of the nation* at large, were permanent at their foundation, and therefore

1 Says Pococke, "Now, the whole of this state of society (in Greece), civil and military, must strike any one as being eminently Asiatic; much of it specially Indian,..... with the attendant tokens of an Indian colonisation, with its corresponding religion and language."

had in them the possibility of a revival. Obviously, it was owing to this circumstance, that India has been a living nation. It was owing to this fact, that she has held her own against all odds, or retained her *self-governing institutions*, notwithstanding innumerable revolutions and countless changes in the dynasties. It was on account of this state of things, that our society has been able to last where nothing else has lasted; although at times, foreign elements have retarded progress and disturbed the exuberance of its force. For, we find, as remarked by Sir Henry Maine, that "this remarkable society, pregnant with interest at every point, and for the moment easily open to our observation, is undoubtedly passing away." (p 24). He moreover, has frankly declared in clear terms that, "It would be absurd to deny that the desintegration of Eastern usage and thought is attributable to British dominion; and added thus: "I must honestly admit that much which had a grandeur of its own is being replaced by a great deal which is poor and ignoble. (pp 26, 27. Maine's Village Communities. Edition. 1890).

Evidently, as will be perceived from the foregoing remarks that, it was the social system of India framed on the great moral principles, the strong co-operation of all Hindus involved in it, and even its mighty *religious binding* with the

high notions of duty, that have formed her claims to greatness, and to the *permanency* of her *Institutions* in the world, even after all the prominent ancient nations on Earth, viz. Egypt, Nineveh, Chaldea, Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome, &c., &c.,—were dead and gone, and their dust also had vanished from the surface of the globe. (*Vide ante p 348*).

Or, as Sir Henry Maine would put it, in respect of our Brahmanical caste-system : “ You will see at once that a solidity is thus given to all groups of men, which has no counterpart in the western world, and you can understand, I think, without difficulty, how it is that all the old natural elements of society have been preserved under the influence of caste, in extraordinary completeness, along with the institutions and ideas which are their appendage.” (*Maine’s Village Communities in the East and West. pp 219, 220. New Edition . 1890*).

We shall now turn for a while to other matters of importance, and pay attention to ideas of the East and the West, as regards the evolution of Sovereignty or Kingship. Bhâra-ta-Varsha or India, the premier country in the world, claiming the most ancient civilization, as also Literature, Science, and Art (*pp 272–282, 383*), presents ideas in respect of the evolution of sovereignty, all her own, without borrowing

any thing from others. In describing this evolution, the primary question of vital importance would be, Where was the real *Origin of Government*? I have already said that our (I) Religious Congress, as also (II) our Village Community, and (III) Popular Assembly, nay even Democracy and Kingship, had their *origin* in the Primitive Patriarchal rule, which I have discussed at length in its several stages before, at the commencement of Chapter II (ante pp. 44 @ 53 ; vide also Chapter III for further details).

Thus, we find the Vedic evidence disclosing the fact that, it was the *Patriarchal rule* that had given birth not only to *the three Estates¹ of the Realm* (त्रीणि सदांसि ; R. V. III. 38. 6. ante p. 48), viz. (I) the Religious Congress, (II) the Village Community, and (III) the Popular Assembly, (all invested with political rights for national good), but also to the *Constitutional*

1 (a) An Estate is one of the classes of the nation invested with political rights. (Dr. Annandale.)

(b) The three *Estates of the realm* in Britain, being the Lords Spiritual, the Lords Temporal, and the Commons.

(c) In Vedic India, (i) *Vidatha*, (ii) *Sabhā*, and (iii) *Samiti* were the three *Estates of the Vedic Empire*. The Lords Spiritual may be said to correspond to our *Representative Elders* of the Religious Congress (विद्वन्), the Lords Temporal to our *Representative Elders* of the Popular Assembly (सभा), and the Commons to the *Representatives* of the Village Communities (समिति), assembled in the National or Popular Assembly.

Government and the *Limited Monarchy* of the Vedic Empire, in which the practice had obtained of *electing a King*. Now, while looking into the qualifications required for acquiring Sovereignty or Kingship, we find in the Mahâ-Bhârata¹ the three-fold origin of this sovereign-power, which, therefore, may be stated in brief as follows:—(a) Noble family, (b) Personal bravery, and (c) Skill in leading the army. From the traditions about the Mahâ-Sammata (or the Great Elect), in the Jâtakas, it appears that the qualities of primitive times in a king, *elected* by the people, were (1) handsomeness, (2) commanding genius, (3) auspiciousness, and (4) perfection all in all, which meant perhaps general competency and dint of virtue. (Vide *Uluka Jâtaka*). The Mahâvastu Avadânâ, moreover, is for the kingship of one, who is not only the most pleasing, but is powerful, able to appreciate and hold his own, reward merit, and punish the wrong-doer. (*vide ante p 216*).

It is hardly necessary here to state that, with all these qualifications, the election of the

1. आचार्य त्रिविधा योनी राज्ञां शास्त्रविनिश्चये ।

सत्कुलीनश्च शूरश्च यश्च सेनां प्रकर्षति ॥ ३६ ॥

(महाभारते. १. १४६. ३६).

(The South Indian Texts Edition, 1906).

"O Preceptor, the origin of Kings has been supposed to be three-fold, according to the Shastras ; viz., the birth in a noble family, heroism, and leadership of the army."

King ever rested with the people, as it was thought, and rightly too, that they were the best judges in respect of the choice, they having been the men on the spot and the persons *entitled to elect*. Obviously, the election of the King by the people or the Nation, plainly indicates that our ancestors of yore were fully aware of their *inherent prerogatives*, of the *equality of the Rights of man*, and of their *responsibility*. They, moreover, had well understood their status and also that of the king, and had, accordingly, after he was duly elected, allowed him to exercise the *Sovereign-power* with great tact, discretion, and wisdom.

Occasionally, however, even the king so elected showed a violent temper, abused his power, and turned out to be a despot, under the false impression that his peoples and subjects were all *for him*, and not he himself *for his peoples* or the Nation. Such a despot had naturally to reap the fruits of his deeds, as mentioned before (*supra pp.* 216, 217).

In cases like these, the king was supposed to be the very curse of men ; and we find the Shata-Patha-Brāhmaṇa actually denouncing him as one, "Who eats up his people" (राष्ट्री विशमन्ति । and declaring him to be "the veritable destroyer of his nation" (तस्माद्राष्ट्री विशंघातुकः श० प० ब्रा० १३. २. २-७, ८).

This serves as a land-mark, and denotes a stage in the development of our Vedic polity, which having ever been for *constitutional monarchy*, was always for guarding the rights of the people. The King, therefore, though he was allowed to exercise ample powers, was never permitted to wield them arbitrarily. Nay, he was, as such, always kept within constitutional limits; and there had come into existence the limited monarchy (ante p. 99).

We, however, perceive that the Mahâ-Bhârata presents to our view another condition of society, prior to the rise of sovereignty. In this, there was neither king nor his kingdom, neither subjects nor slaves. But, all were on a footing of equality. As such, therefore, the affairs of the society at large, were conducted on the great principle of moral law, rectitude of conduct, sacred trust, religious piety, social sympathy, mutual help, parental duty, and the observance of virtues, admittedly good at all times.

नैव राज्यं न राजासीन्न च दंडो न दांडिकः ।

धर्मेणैव प्रजाः सर्वा रक्षन्ति स्म परस्परम् ॥१४॥

(Mahâ Bhârata. XII. 58-14).

This state of things, however, did not continue or last long, and everything having become engulfed in chaos,¹ there was the esta-

1. द्वैन्यं परमुपाजग्मुस्ततस्ताम्नोहआविशत् ।

(म० भा० १२-५८-१५).

blishment of kingship, and kings were invested with sovereignty,¹ for the protection of person and property, for proper discharge of responsible duties, and for regular execution of onerous functions of the State.

I may here venture to state that, there has also been in existence another theory amongst the Hindus, and this propounds the *divine origin* of kings. For instance, Manu lays down that government of the king has been by *divine appointment*, and that king was created by God, for the protection of all.

रक्षार्थमस्य सर्वस्य राजानमसृजत्प्रभुः ॥ ३ ॥

(मनुस्मृतिः । ७.३).

Even the Mahâ Bhârata speaks of the *divine origin* of king, and says that the very essence of God-hood is manifested there in the form of man.

महती देवता ह्येषा नररूपेण तिष्ठति ॥ ४० ॥

(Mahâ Bhârata. XII. 67. 40).

Now, adverting, for the sake of comparison, to the ideas of the West, in respect of the origin and evolution of Sovereignty, we perceive John Austin in his well-known Analysis of Law, defining 'Sovereign as a person, or a determinate body of persons, to whom the bulk of the community is habitually obedient.' This sovereign-body is

1. Mahâ Bhârata, (XII. 58. 95 @ 125).

said to be the Government of the country in popular parlance, and the varieties existing in its constitution are known as so many forms of government.

Herbert Spencer, in his *Principles of Sociology*, represents Government as but a living organism, the existence of which is considered necessary to the conception of society. He, therefore, deems physical strength, mental superiority, strong will, deep foresight, and large fortune, as the attributes of King-ship. Hobbes supposed that government was the result of an agreement amongst men to keep the peace, when every thing having been in a state of war, all got sick of it, and were hankering after rest or quiet life. Locke, however, thinks, otherwise, and observes that the origin of Government is not in war, but in a state of liberty and equality. For, says he, "Men being by nature all free, equal, and independent, no one can be put out of this estate and subjected to the political power of another, without his own consent. The only way whereby any one divests himself of his natural liberty, and puts on the *bonds of civil society*, is by agreeing with other men to join and unite into a community." (*Vide Locke On Civil Government. c. viii*).

"Social Compact" and Government of the king by divine appointment, are also other Wes-

tern theories, of which the latter seems to be the traditional residue of the Hindu Original. (*Vide ante p 381*).

Our Vedic Government, however, of Primitive times, which is admittedly the most ancient on Earth, shows that (1) Sovereignty had its origin in the primary Patriarchal rule; and that (2) in this rule, the head of the family was supposed to be its ruler. Recent investigations also tend to prove that, (1) family had much importance in the primitive state of society; that (2) it had much to do with the social coherence of tribes; and that (3) the Government of a tribe resembles the government of a house-hold.

Thus, it will be perceived that our Hindu politicians also have discussed various forms of Government, in the very early period of this world's civilization. For, having been in advance of the times, they have treated not only of the primitive *Patriarchal rule*, and of the *Democracy* governed by three national Assemblies (विद्य, सभा, and समिति), which formed the *three Estates* of the Vedic Empire, (*ante p 377*), but also of the *Constitutional Government*, of the *Equality of rights*, of the *origin of Sovereignty*, of the government of Despots, of the end of their rule, of the *Limited Monarchy*, and even of the *Divine Origin* of the king (*supra p 99,379,380,381*).

said to be the Government of the country in popular parlance, and the varieties existing in its constitution are known as so many forms of government.

Herbert Spencer, in his *Principles of Sociology*, represents Government as but a living organism, the existence of which is considered necessary to the conception of society. He, therefore, deems physical strength, mental superiority, strong will, deep foresight, and large fortune, as the attributes of King-ship. Hobbes supposed that government was the result of an agreement amongst men to keep the peace, when every thing having been in a state of war, all got sick of it, and were hankering after rest or quiet life. Locke, however, thinks, otherwise, and observes that the origin of Government is not in war, but in a state of liberty and equality. For, says he, "Men being by nature all free, equal, and independent, no one can be put out of this estate and subjected to the political power of another, without his own consent. The only way whereby any one divests himself of his natural liberty, and puts on the *bonds of civil society*, is by agreeing with other men to join and unite into a community." (*Vide Locke On Civil Government. c. viii*).

"Social Compact" and Government of the king by divine appointment, are also other Wes-

tern theories, of which the latter seems to be the traditional residue of the Hindu Original. (*Vide ante p 381*).

Our Vedic Government, however, of Primitive times, which is admittedly the most ancient on Earth, shows that (1) Sovereignty had its origin in the primary Patriarchal rule; and that (2) in this rule, the head of the family was supposed to be its ruler. Recent investigations also tend to prove that, (1) family had much importance in the primitive state of society; that (2) it had much to do with the social coherence of tribes; and that (3) the Government of a tribe resembles the government of a house-hold.

Thus, it will be perceived that our Hindu politicians also have discussed various forms of Government, in the very early period of this world's civilization. For, having been in advance of the times, they have treated not only of the primitive *Patriarchal rule*, and of the *Democracy* governed by three national Assemblies (विद्य, सभा, and समिति), which formed the *three Estates* of the Vedic Empire, (*ante p 377*), but also of the *Constitutional Government*, of the *Equality of rights*, of the *origin of Sovereignty*, of the government of Despots, of the end of their rule, of the *Limited Monarchy*, and even of the *Divine Origin* of the king (*supra p 99,379,380,381*).

These ideas, in respect of the form and constitution of Government in olden times, bear, it is respectfully presumed, a very favourable comparison with the advanced polity of the West, and the European notions of modern politicians. But, all this notwithstanding, the inveterate prejudice, profound ignorance, empty pride, and vanity of some Westerners, would still assert themselves. Nay, after showing contempt for all, except the Europeans, they would most vauntingly declare that, " They (Europeans) were the only communities in which the governed visibly took some share in the work of government. " They would, moreover, further announce to the world boastfully that, " Outside the European system, as outside the Greek system, we have only the stereotyped uniformity of despotism, whether savage or civilized. The question of forms of government, therefore, belongs entirely to the European races. " (*Vide* Encyclopædia Britannica Vol. XI. p 10. Ninth Edition). But, pray what about *the various forms of Government*, prevailing in India in ancient times ? (*vide supra* p 385).

In this way, these Western writers make no secret of the *European monopoly* of Self-Government, as also of the various forms thereof. But, not content even with this sole monopoly of self-government and the vain boast of the various

forms of it, as *belonging only to the European races*, they would fain exhibit their estimation of the real worth of India, by ranking her with the savage aborigines of Figi Islands, and even by declaring her *unfit for self-government*, as distinguished from those, who, on account of their fitness, are allowed to govern themselves. For, says the Western writer thus :—"One leading distinction may be drawn, namely, between the communities which are allowed to govern themselves and those which, either as being unfit for self-government, like India and Fiji, or on account of the military necessities of the situation, as Malta and Gibraltar, are governed by the officers of the English Government." (*Vide Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol XI. p 20. Ninth Edition*).

We shall now turn for a while to England, said to be the land of liberty, and give a bird's-eye view of its primitive and subsequent social state and form of Government, along with the most terrible disorders that convulsed the country for centuries. The natives of England when conquered by the Romans in B. C. 55, were in a very savage state of life, as they lived almost half-naked, clad themselves in skins leaving their limbs bare, and fed either on roots, leaves, milk, or flesh, as described before (*Vide ante p 31. Footnote*). Those, however, who had inter-

course with Gaul, were more civilized than the rest of the people.

The country, as the Reader is aware, was invaded and partially conquered by the Romans under Julius Cæsar in B. C. 55 ; when, the British chief having come to terms with him, hostages were given after settling the tribute, and Cæsar had returned to Gaul. This was the *first invasion* of England by the Romans.

During the next ninety eight, or say about one hundred years, Britain was left alone by the Romans. But, in A. D. 43, there was the *second¹ invasion* of Britain, and Claudius the Emperor of Rome, had sent his two lieutenants—Plautius and Vespasian, for conquest and subjugation of the island. These having gained footing on the island, crossed the Thames, penetrated Essex, drove out the Britons, and subdued the tribes of Hampshire and Wight. Every attempt was subsequently made by the Romans gradually, for the reduction of the island ; and by the end of A. D. 300, there was complete ascendancy of Rome over the island, which remained under the yoke and subjection of the Roman rule, until A. D. 410, when owing to the incursions in Italy of the Goths and other northern tribes, the Roman garrison was with-

1 "Empire" History of England, Edition 1891. p. 28.

drawn from Britannia¹ to guard Rome itself, which was the heart of the Roman Empire.

The early years of Roman rule in Britain were, as observed by Dr. Wm. Francis Collier, but the dark hours before the dawn, as the country had suffered shameful wrongs and insults from the Roman conquerors. The Romans, however, had taught the natives to develop the resources of their country, by making roads therein where practicable, and opening it for export-trade.

As soon, however, as the Roman protection was withdrawn, the Picts² and the Scots² took an opportunity to invade England (A. D. 410), by breaking through the Roman walls which were now left unguarded. They pillaged the northern part of the country, as the Britons,

1 This was the name given by the Romans to that part of the island which lay to the south of Scotland, and now known as England, to distinguish it from its northern part, which the Romans used to call by the name of Caledonia. This, however, was subsequently called Scotland by the Scots, as these had become the ruling tribe in the north of the island.

2 (a) The wild tribes who inhabited the northern and eastern part of Scotland were called Picts (Latin *picti* meaning "painted people"). They, however, belonged to the Celtic race, like the Britons of the south; and the name Briton not only belongs to the people of the south, but also to the Picts who lived in the north.

(b) The Scots were also a Celtic race, had come over from Ireland, and settled on the west coast of Scotland.

owing to pusillanimity, were altogether unable to hold their own, and became lords of the land. The Britons, therefore, had, during their need, requested the Romans to help them. But they were asked to defend themselves, and had thus to yield to the vigour and force of the invaders who naturally became masters, of the situation. This was the *third invasion* of England, which was made subsequent to the withdrawal of the Roman garrison in A. D. 410.

The *fourth invasion* of England was about the year A. D. 419, by the "Pirates" of the North Sea", whom the Romans called "Saxons." These had come in larger numbers than ever, settled in England for plunder, in southern and middle

1 (a) History has called the invaders of England from beyond the North-Sea, as "Pirates of the North Sea", or "the Sea-rovers." (*The Empire History*. Edition 1891. pp 35, 36, 38, 45).

(b) Dr. Collier calls the invaders of the three tribes, viz. the Jutes, Angles, and Saxons, as the "Pirates of the Danish and German Coasts, who had hardly been kept in check by the Roman fleets." (*History of the British Empire*. Edition 1882. p 19).

(c) "The Angles settled chiefly on the eastern coasts of Britain, from the Forth to the Thames. They may be called the Northern English ; and the Saxons, who settled chiefly in the south and middle parts, may be termed the Southern English." (*Empire History*. 1891 p 36).

(d) I may here mention that West-Saxony or Wessex was founded by Cerdic in A. D. 419, South-Saxony by Ella in A. D. 490, and East Saxony by Ercenwin in A. D. 527. (vide *British Empire*. By Dr. Collier. Ed. 1882. p 20).

parts that suited them best, and established their power in 419 A. D., as well as they could. The petty states of Britain, thereupon, made but feeble attempts at union, by the election of a king. But the claims for sovereignty and the consequent contentions thereon, only made matters worse.

Then, there was the *fifth invasion* of England in A. D. 449, by the Jutes, the pirates of the Danish coast, or the people of Jutland (the northern part of Denmark). The leaders of these invaders were two brothers, Hengist and Horsa, who were hired and called by Vortigern, the chief of the Britons, to assist him, as he was at his wit's end and did not know what to do, in driving the northern enemies. This, the Jutes and their leaders did very easily. But, after repelling the enemies of Vortigern, they turned against him, seized Kent, and shared the spoils. (A. D. 449). Hingist founded Kent in A. D. 457.

After this, it was the turn of the Angles, the pirates of the Danish coast, to invade England, and the *invasion*¹ of the country by them in A. D. 547, was the *sixth*. In course of time, (i. e. about A. D. 547-582), they took possession of

¹ History tells us that Northumbria was founded by Eda in A. D. 547, East Anglia by Uffa in A. D. 575, and Mercia by Crida in A. D. 582. (Collier's British Empire. Edition 1882. p 20).

Britain, settled chiefly on its eastern coasts from the Forth to the Thames, plundered the country, and drove away the inhabitants without mercy, who, thereupon, had taken shelter in western mountains. Of these, some, says Gildas, a British monk and a writer of history, "were caught in the hills and slaughtered; others, worn out with hunger, gave themselves up to life-long slavery. Some fled across the sea; others trusted themselves to the clefts of the mountains, to the forests, and to the rocks along the coast." (*Vide The Empire History of England. Edition 1891. p 36*).

In short, the Picts and the Scots pillaged the northern country. While, the pirates of the Danish and German Coasts, viz. the Jutes, the Angles, and the Saxons, who were not at all kept in check even by the fleets of Rome, descended upon the eastern and southern coasts of England, devastated the land by burning, slaying, as also by plundering without mercy, at a time when, the country itself was all torn to pieces by internal dissensions. Thus, during these very troublous times, and even for more than a century and a half afterwards, there were from end to end civil commotions, disturbances, and disorders; and hords of invaders, from the countries lying between the Elbe and the Rhine, incessantly poured upon the southern and eastern shores of

England, forcing the natives west and north, occupying all the lowland tracts, and seizing all the property that they could lay their hands upon. These invaders, as described in history, were of three tribes, viz. Jutes, Angles, and Saxons; who founded the Seven Kingdoms, known as the Saxon Heptarchy. (A. D. 419-582). (*Vide* History of the British Empire. By William Francis Collier, L. L. D. Edition 1882. pp 19, 20).

It has been said that the chief opponent of the Saxon invaders was Arthur (A. D. 542), the head of the Silures in South-Wales. But, even the kings themselves of Heptarchy were at constant war with one another. None could keep his own power long, as the stream of roaving and invading hoards of pirates,—the Danes, Norsemen, and others, had ever continued to flow from the other side of the North Sea, for plundering England and settling in the country.

In A. D. 787, there was the *seventh invasion* of England, and it was made by the Danes, or Norsemen. These had begun to invade the island with great rapidity; and the swift ships of these intrepid sea-rovers, which bore the flag of the Black Raven, had become the terror of England, as they plundered the country and settled in it by fighting with the natives for land.

These invasions of England, merely for plundering it, continued, even so late as the reign of Alfred the Great (A. D. 871); when, the Danes having become masters of the country for some time, grew very formidable as well as powerful, defeated Alfred at Wilton, and obliged him to enter into negotiations with them, to whom, at last, a large indemnity having been paid, they withdrew from Wessex. This done, the Danes turned towards Mercia and Northumbria, where without showing the least mercy, they burned, butchered, and laid waste the country.

After some years, Alfred was again overtaken by misfortune, and having been surrounded by the Danes in a night-attack on Chippenham, he had to flee in disguise and take shelter in the marshes of Somersetshire, in a herdsman's cottage (A. D. 878). Subsequently, however, in A. D. 893, Alfred defeated the invaders, and drove the pirates from England for a time. Yet, they were a constant source of trouble to England.

Alfred was a wise king, and his claim to the epithet of "the Great," seems to have been founded on his political institutions and the Code of laws, in which the chief enactments of Ethelbert and Offa were embodied, and which

were executed with such strict impartiality that crime had become very rare. Alfred died in A. D. 901.

Some years after, we find the Scots and the Danes again infesting England and ravaging the country (A. D. 938). But, they were defeated. While, in the reign of Ethelred—the “Unready,” dark days came upon the land through the king’s foolishness. “The country was no longer united as in Edgar’s reign, but was broken up into a number of little states, which were constantly quarrelling with each other. To Denmark and Norway, the news went that neither the English king nor his people was strong enough to withstand an attack; and so, band after band of warlike Northmen landed on the shores of England and entered the country to burn and plunder, as they had done before. Ethelred would not fight. He did what seemed an easier thing. He gave the Danes money to go away. This money he got from his people, in the form of a tax, which was called the Dane-geld, or Dane-money. The Danes took the money and went away, but only to return soon again, in larger numbers than ever.”

“Ethelred at last grew tired of the constant coming of the Danes. He had no more money to spare, and so he thought of a plan to get

rid of them. He sent secret orders throughout Wessex, to put to death on a certain day (the festival of St. Brice) every Dane in the country. These orders were carried out, and one of the murdered Danes was a sister of the king of Denmark. Swift punishment followed. King Sweyn hurried over from Denmark with a large army and invaded the country. A number of English joined with the Danes against Ethelred, who was obliged to flee for safety to Normandy. Before his departure, the dethroned king said to some of his nobles ; "We are not overcome by the swords or courage of the enemy, but by the treason and perfidy of our friends. Our navy is betrayed into the hands of the Danes, our armies are betrayed by the revolt of most of our officers ; our designs betrayed to the enemy by our counsellors, who, instead of extricating us from troubles, are continually persuading us to infamous treaties ; and your valour and loyalty are rendered ineffectual by the treachery of your leaders." (*Vide* "The Empire" History of England. Edition 1891, pp 52, 53).

Thus, Ethelred was defeated, and Sweyn, king of Denmark and the leader of the Danes, who had invaded England and burst upon its coasts (A. D. 1013), had taken terrible revenge. Then Oxford and Winchester became powerless,

and having been unable to hold their own, fell before the invaders. Thereupon, Sweyn was proclaimed King at Bath and London. This *invasion* of England by Sweyn was [the *eighth* and yet the invasions of the country by foreigners had no end. For, after the death of Sweyn there was again a bloody contest for the crown of England, between the Saxon and the Danish rivals. Ethelred and Canute took a barbarous revenge. The former provoked repeated incursions by renewed murders of the Danes ; while, the latter with large force, again invaded England in A. D. 1017. In this the *ninth invasion* of the country, Canute pushed towards its capital, by leaving tracks of blood, devastation, and ashes behind him, assaulted London twice, compelled Edmund to divide the Kingdom, and became the undisputed master and king of England, after Edmund's death in A. D. 1017.

The Danish kings ruled over England uptil A. D. 1041, and then the Saxon line having been restored, Edward the Confessor became king of England in 1042. Having spent about twenty-seven years at the Norman Court, he was but a Norman in dress and education, speech and manners, nay in every thing. It is therefore very natural that he regarded the Norman friends of his youth with peculiar favour, and bestowed upon them some of the chief offices of the State.

Obviously, this was not at all liked by the nobility of England; and some friction having been caused between the burghers and the retainers of Eustace who was a Norman Count that had married the sister of the king, a bloody riot had occurred at Dover, a town under Earl Godwin's protection. The King therefore commanded the Earl to punish the citizens who were insolent. But, the haughty Earl, rather than submit, himself took the field.

No sooner had this revolt begun, which, however, was ineffective, as Earl Godwin's army had deserted him, than king Edward asked assistance from William Duke of Normandy. The Duke, accordingly, having made preparations, had appeared off the English channel. But, all need for help had passed away. Yet, William landed in England with his retinue, and was hospitably entertained by the king, who, it is said, had also appointed him heir to the crown. The Duke then took advantage of his visit to England, saw personally the state of things there, heard French spoken everywhere, visited Dover, Canterbury, and other leading towns which, he observed, were defended by Norman garrisons, and also took notice of the fact that, there was Norman influence every where in the country (A. D. 1052).

We may here notice with advantage the fact that, the Normans of this period were

thoroughly French. It should, however, be remembered that, the Normans *were not* French people. They were, really speaking, Danes and Northmen, who, about over a hundred years before this time, had settled in the north of France, in the same manner as many of their countrymen had settled in England. Evidently, the province of France was called Normandy or North-man-dy, because it was the land of, or was inhabited by, Northmen.

Now, king Edward died in January A. D. 1066, and Harold, the second son of Earl Godwin, was crowned king of England. William Duke of Normandy expected that Harold would keep up his promise, which he had made to the Duke, (while he was the latter's prisoner during a shipwreck), to the effect that he would help him (the Duke) to the Crown of England on the death of Edward. But Harold did not regard the promise as binding, as it had been forced from him. The Duke, therefore, began to make preparations to invade England.

Thus, while there was pending an invasion of England from the South, there was again an unexpected invasion of England by foes from beyond the North Sea. This was the *tenth invasion* of the country (September 25th, A. D. 1066). Hardrada, king of Norway and Tostig, the outlawed brother of Harold had invaded England,

by sailing up the Humber, and capturing York, the capital of Northumbria. However, in the battle that ensued at Stramford Bridge, both the king of Norway and Tostig, the outlaw, were killed on the 25th of September 1066.

But, the southern *invasion* of England, which was the *eleventh* of its kind, at the southern extremity of the country, from beyond the English Channel, was the most serious, full of great risks, nay extremely dangerous, and even fraught with evil consequences of a far-reaching character, as will be presently seen. This invasion was made by William the Norman, Duke of Normandy, who having landed on the coast of Sussex, passed on to Hastings without delay. King Harold who was sitting at a banquet in York when he received the news, marched night and day, and reached the Senlac Hill, which was nine miles from Hastings, where the battle having been fought, Harold lay dead on the field, and William the Norman, won the victory (14th October 1066).

In this way, William Duke of Normandy, became the conqueror of England, which he and his race ruled; and the country lived in thralldom for over three centuries. We shall, therefore, at this stage, turn our attention to the social condition of England and its polity, during the preceding and the subsequent period, to enable the Reader

to form a general idea of the same. British history does not go beyond two thousand years ; or in other words, it goes back only a few years before the Christian Era. It describes the island of Britain as a home of savage races that dwelt in forests and marshy lands, clad themselves in skins leaving their limbs bare, and lived on leaves, roots, milk, or flesh. These wandering tribes were called Britons, and their mode of living was rude and wild. In the middle of the country, these savages led a nomad's life, and therefore gave no attention whatever to the cultivation of the soil. However, the natives that lived on the southern shores of the island of Britain, and had communication with Gaul, were less rude, and wore garments of wool. Their religion was Druidism, which sanctioned human sacrifices, allowed the worship of the sun, moon, as also other objects as gods, and believed in the transmigration of souls, or life after death.

The Druids were the priests of Britons their bards, law-givers, and even their teachers. The Roman General Plautius, however, who had brought under subjection a great part of Britain (A. D. 50), thinking that the complete reduction and subjugation of the island was not possible, unless all the Druids were destroyed, as he supposed that it was they who encouraged and taught the people to raise the standard of revolt

made up his mind to invade the island of Anglesea, (which the Romans called Mona and where the Druids resided), put to death all the Druids, destroyed the altars, and cut down their sacred groves (A. D. 61). Thus, with the destruction of Druids, there was an end to all the learning, the laws, the poetry, the history, and also the religion of the ancient Britons.

This massacre of the innocent Druids by the Romans, was certainly most cruel, especially when there was no cause for provocation on the part of the Druids, except the fact that the Roman General was ever labouring under the impression that the Druids were chiefly instrumental in, and the cause of, the frequent rising and attacks of the Britons. It, therefore, affords another instance of the degenerate state of morals of the Romans, to whom, as observed before (ante pp 367 @ 372), nothing was too base or too revolting, nothing too treacherous or too inhuman, nothing too immoral or too unworthy, provided their own ends were accomplished and the desired object was secured. Says the Historian : "Nothing can be more detestable than the public morality of Rome, throughout her career of conquest. No arts were too base to be used by her statesmen and generals." (vide Liddell's History of Rome. Edition 1901. p 466). The Romans, however, after disarming

the Britons, had taught them the arts of peace, introduced their language and manners, and endeavoured to spread Christianity in the island.

During the repeated invasions of England for over ten centuries, by the Romans, the Northmen, the Saxons, the Angles, the Jutes, the Danes, the Normans, and other Teutonic races, who, excepting the Romans, having settled in the country and made their new homes there after conquering it, had brought with them their manners and customs, laws and institutions, their social frame work and rude representation in local affairs, of which the natives were altogether ignorant before. Subsequent, therefore, to the conquest of Britain by these foreigners, it seems to have been divided into four classes :— (1) the Nobles and the Earls, who were supposed to be men of high birth ; (2) the Thaness or large land-owners ; (3) the Ceorls (or Churls), who either cultivated land or were engaged in trade and were freemen in many respects, and (4) the Slaves, who were most numerous. Of these, many were the natives of Britain, who having been driven away by the invaders, had sold themselves into slavery to get food.

History tells us that two-thirds of the Anglo-Saxon nation were slaves, who were called *Villeins* by the Normans. There were others also who were slaves, because born in bondage, captured

in war, or arrested for debt and crime. Very sad, painful, and humiliating indeed, was the ceremony of degradation. Sale and purchase of slaves was very common ; and the price of each slave was usually four times that of an ox. The importation as well as exportation of slaves was on a large scale, and the Anglo-Saxons of the coast used to carry on a very profitable trade in men and women. The slave-traffic was carried on with impunity, and Bristol was for a long time notorious for its Slave-markets, during the Anglo-Saxon period of the sixth century. (*Vide* History of the British Empire. By William Francis Collier, L. L. D. Edition 1882. pp 41, 42 ; as also the " Empire History " of England. Edition 1891. pp 36, 38, 42, 68).

All this bespeaks a woeful condition and very savage state of life ; nay, it indicates an extremely low regard for morals and humanity, not to say an utter moral depravity, which tended to increase the proportion of every sort of crime in the country. Barbarous punishments were therefore inflicted on criminals for checking it, and the offenders were either condemned to death, to loss of any of their limbs, or to mutilation.

Thus, as observed by a Western critic, " For five centuries, the country (of England) was convulsed with incessant wars—wars with the

Britons, whom the invaders were driving from their homes, wars between the several kingdoms, wars with the Welsh, wars with the Picts, wars with the Danes. How could the people continue to assert their civil rights, amid the clash of arms and a frequent change of masters? The warrior—kings and their armed followers, were rulers in the land which they had conquered.”

“At the same time, the unsettled condition of the country repressed the social advancement of its people. * * * * Under such conditions, the great body of the people continued as peasants, handicraftsmen, and slaves.” (Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. xviii. p 303. Ninth Edition).

In fact, there was all disorder in the country, and chaos had reigned supreme every where, owing to incessant foreign invasions, wars with the Britons who were driven from their homes, and internal troubles that had convulsed the country for centuries. Thus, the altogether unsettled condition of the land had, it seems, repressed the virtues, the morals, and the advancement of the people, and this, with advantage, may be compared with the State of India, after the Mahomedan rule. In the circumstances, we find the social condition of the Anglo-Saxons, as described below :—“The morality of the Anglo-Saxons was very far from being pure.

The characters of even their best Kings were stained with drunkenness and worse vices. The chief crimes were murder and theft.....Theft became so common in the time of the later Anglo Saxon Kings, that it was punished by death. This was abolished by Canute, who substituted mutilation, condemning a thief, three times convicted, to the loss of his eyes, nose, ears, and upper lip."... (p 42).

" The daily life of even the noblest Anglo-Saxons was that of a half-savage people. The war and turbulence, which were the chief characteristics of at least four centuries of this period, were not favourable to the cultivation of the domestic virtues"..... (p 43).

"The general practice of the musical art is almost the only redeeming trait in a picture of coarse sensuality."..... (p 44).

"When the Anglo-Saxons settled in Britain, they were the slaves of a gross and absurd idolatry, which prevailed among all the northern tribes of Europe.".....

" The Anglo-Saxon priests spent their leisure in the practice of many arts.....The monasteries were now, as they continued to be for many centuries, almost the only seats of learning ; and from their quiet cells issued the scanty pages of our Anglo-Saxon literature.....(pp 44,

45. *Vide* Collier's History of the British Empire. Edition 1882).

In polity, however, the invaders of England—the Anglo-Saxons and others, appear to have advanced a little more. For, they had a council with but rude representation, consisting of athelings or princes (who were generally, if not exclusively, sons and brothers of the king), nobles or ealdormen, large land-holders, principal ecclesiastics, &c. This was called WITENAGEMOT or “ The Assembly of the wise,” and met regularly at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide. On special occasions, however, it was often summoned ; and with it rested the appointment of a new King.

In these circumstances, it may be said with good reason, that the idea of *Self-government* in England had its origin in the invasions of the country by the Saxons, the Jutes, the Angles, the Danes, the Normans, and other Teutonic races, who, after they commenced conquering Britain from A. D. 419-till 1066, had brought with them their laws and customs, their village communities and rude representation. It is, therefore, naturally thought that the origin of Parliament in England is to be traced to the Anglo-Saxon times, and that “in the Anglo-Saxon polity, as developed during their rule in England, all the constituent parts of Parliament” are found. (*Vide*

Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol xviii. Ninth Edition p 302). I may here state for the sake of comparison that, our Hindu Self-Government had its origin in the indigenous Vedic Government of India, centuries nay millenniums before it was known in Greece or Rome, England or elsewhere. (*supra pp 19-22, 126-130, 264*).

The polity of the Anglo-Saxons was, however, in no time, set aside and overthrown by the Norman conquerors, after they subjugated England. The Saxons who formed the population of the country, were altogether subdued, and no power could withstand the inflexible Conquerors of Britain. "A stern foreign king had seized the crown, and was prepared to rule his conquered realm by the sword. He brought with him the absolutist principle of Continental rulers and the advanced feudal system of France and Normandy. Feudalism had been slowly gaining ground under the Saxon kings, and now it was firmly established as a military organisation. William the Conqueror at once rewarded his warlike barons and followers with enormous grants of land. The Saxon landowners and peasants were dispoiled, and the invaders settled in their homesteads. The king claimed the broad lands of England as his own, by right of conquest; and when he allowed his warriors to share the spoil, he attached the strict condition

of military service, in return for every grant of land. An effective army of occupation of all ranks was thus quartered upon every province throughout the realm. England was held by the sword ; a foreign king, foreign nobles, and a foreign soldiery were in possession of the soil, and swore fealty to their master, from whom they held it. Saxon bishops were deposed, and foreign prelates appointed to rule over the English Church. Instead of calling a national Witinagemot, the king took counsel with the officers of his state and household, the bishops, abbots, earls, barons, and knights, by whom he was pleased to surround himself. Some of the forms of a national council, were indeed maintained, and its counsel and consent were proclaimed in the making of laws ; but, in truth, the king was absolute."

"Such a revolution seemed fatal to the liberties and ancient customs of Saxon-England. What power could withstand the harsh conqueror. In the meantime, the strong rule of the Normans, bitter as it was to Englishmen, repressed intestine wars and the disorders of a divided realm. Civil justice was fairly administered."

"While these social changes were steadily advancing, the barons were already preparing the way for the assertion of popular rights. * * *

The population of the country was still Saxon ; they had been subdued, but had not been driven forth from the land like the Britons in former invasions." (*Vide* Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. xviii. p 303. Ninth Edition).

This, in a nutshell, was the dire effect of the Norman Conquest, and it had materially affected the polity of the country. Yet, the people were gradually asserting their rights, and several kings while recognising them, were granting illusory promises, until in the reign of king John much progress having been made in the liberties of the nation, the Great Charter was extorted from him, in A. D. 1215. This was called the **Magna Charta**.

Will the Rulers and Sovereigns, who now triumphantly hold the destinies of other nations in their own hands, kindly remember what *foreign yoke* and *subjugation* means ? And will they be good enough to treat with justice and equanimity the subject races and the conquered people ? This, however, is only by the way.

Of the character and moral principles of the king from whom the Great Charter was forced, history tells us that "he was a mean coward, a shameless liar, the most profligate in a profligate age, the most faithless of a faithless race" (*vide*

Collier's British Empire. Edition 1882. p 81); and his reign is said to be the blackest in the annals of England. The King repented his having signed the document, and the first tidings the barons heard after the Charter became an accomplished fact, were to the effect that, the despot had raised an army of mercenaries, who were laying waste the land, by burning towns and corn-fields.

During, the next fifty years, however, further progress was made in the liberties of the people ; and Simon de Montford, who was Earl of Leicester and a great patriot in advance of the age, had fought tooth and nail for the people's rights. Nay, when in A. D. 1265, Parliament was called, he had not only summoned representatives from cities and boroughs, but also prelates, barons, and knights of the shire, already comprised constitutionally in the assembly. This, therefore, was the beginning of the present House of Commons and the House of Lords, the prelates as also the barons corresponding to the House of Lords (Spiritual and Temporal), and the rest to the House of Commons.

All this was brought about against the will of the King, who, it may be noted with advantage in passing, had long promised to make the reforms required by the nation. He had, however, purposely delayed the introduction thereof,

even after the Enactments were passed known as the *Provisions of Oxford*, and he was obliged to swear to obey these *Provisions of Oxford*, in A. D. 1258. But the swearing was of no avail, as the king had not the remotest intention to abide by his word. And the most shameful and irritating thing of the affair, after four years of disorder, was that "Henry had sent to the Pope for leave to break the promises that he had made at Oxford"; and "the Pope said, he might do so. Upon which, the king seized the Tower of London, and sent out orders to the people of all the counties not to obey the barons' officers." (*vide* The "Empire History" of England. Edition 1891. p 123).

This naturally kindled Civil War, in which the King having been defeated, he with his two sons was made a prisoner, and these with the king had remained in close custody for some time.

It is certainly most painful to see that the King, who was ever expected to have had the interests of his subjects at heart, should have himself stooped to break the solemn pledges given by him to his nation, and thus to morally commit an offence that completely lowered his position. That even the Pope should have given his consent to the perpetration of the act, especially, when such a thing as this has always

been deemed to be a moral degradation, and an indication of the degenerate state of the society, was still more annoying; and that both the Head of the Church as also the Head of the State, should have thus condescended to play false, and should have not at all considered it below their high dignity to play the hypocrite, betrays a total absence of moral feelings and the least regard for truthfulness.

In the reign of Edward I, the Parliament seems to have assumed its present form of King, Lords, and Commons. The Commons, however, had not yet (A. D. 1295) learnt to value their franchise, as considerable numbers absented themselves, thinking the attendance-service to be a thankless task and therefore tried to evade the burden imposed upon them by the crown. Besides, there also appears another reason for the want of interest shown by the Commons, as we see that the towns were enfranchised at the *will* and *caprice* of the sovereign. Nay, they could also be excluded at the pleasure of the authorities that had power to do so, and the least show of independence was followed by the omission of another writ of summons.

The Rolls of Parliament indicate the existence in England of the Three Estates of the Realm, in the early part of the reign of

even after the Enactments were passed known as the *Provisions of Oxford*, and he was obliged to swear to obey these *Provisions of Oxford*, in A. D. 1258. But the swearing was of no avail, as the king had not the remotest intention to abide by his word. And the most shameful and irritating thing of the affair, after four years of disorder, was that "Henry had sent to the Pope for leave to break the promises that he had made at Oxford"; and "the Pope said, he might do so. Upon which, the king seized the Tower of London, and sent out orders to the people of all the counties not to obey the barons' officers." (*vide* The "Empire History" of England. Edition 1891. p 123).

This naturally kindled Civil War, in which the King having been defeated, he with his two sons was made a prisoner, and these with the king had remained in close custody for some time.

It is certainly most painful to see that the King, who was ever expected to have had the interests of his subjects at heart, should have himself stooped to break the solemn pledges given by him to his nation, and thus to morally commit an offence that completely lowered his position. That even the Pope should have given his consent to the perpetration of the act, especially, when such a thing as this has always

been deemed to be a moral degradation, and an indication of the degenerate state of the society, was still more annoying; and that both the Head of the Church as also the Head of the State, should have thus condescended to play false, and should have not at all considered it below their high dignity to play the hypocrite, betrays a total absence of moral feelings and the least regard for truthfulness.

In the reign of Edward I, the Parliament seems to have assumed its present form of King, Lords, and Commons. The Commons, however, had not yet (A. D. 1295) learnt to value their franchise, as considerable numbers absented themselves, thinking the attendance-service to be a thankless task and therefore tried to evade the burden imposed upon them by the crown. Besides, there also appears another reason for the want of interest shown by the Commons, as we see that the towns were enfranchised at the *will* and *caprice* of the sovereign. Nay, they could also be excluded at the pleasure of the authorities that had power to do so, and the least show of independence was followed by the omission of another writ of summons.

The Rolls of Parliament indicate the existence in England of the Three Estates of the Realm, in the early part of the reign of

Edward III. The Estates¹ appear to have deliberated separately, but delivered a collective answer to the King. The date of this event, however, has not been ascertained with any clearness. It may probably be A. D. 1351, or the early part of the king's reign.

I venture here, by the way, to respectfully invite the attention of the Reader to the fact that, while England claimed the *Three Estates of the Realm* only from the middle of the fourteenth century A. D., these —(*the Three Estates of the Vedic Empire*)—were known to the Hindus, and formed *a part and parcel of their polity and Self-Government* of the remotest Rig-Vedic period, centuries nay millenniums before the Christian Era. (*Vide ante pp 377, 325, 101 ; Professor Bloomfield's remarks on p 325 Foot-Note (c), and Mr. Tilak's observation in respect of our inter-glacial civilization p. 101.*)

The Parliament now, had, to all appearances at any rate, assumed its present form. But, as a matter of fact, it was certainly far from enjoying the real power that it exercised subse-

1 (a) Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. xviii. Ninth Edition. p 306.

(b) *The Three Estates of the Realm* in Britain are (1) the Lords Spiritual, (2) the Lords Temporal, and (3) the Commons. The (4) *fourth Estate* is said to be the News-paper:press, or Journalists. (*Vide Dr. Annandale's Concise Dictionary. Edition 1897. p 244*).

quently, or has been now exercising. For, the kings were still paramount, as all sought their favour, including even the nobles and the clergy; and, with the whole power in the hands of the kings, the legislation had become the prerogative of the crown rather than of the Parliament. In short, there was a total relapse of Parliamentary influence; and its life may be said to have expired with the close of the Wars of the Roses in A. D. 1485. For, the powerful baronage was decimated, and their vast estates were confiscated to the crown. The royal treasury thereby was enriched as a matter of course, and there remained no more, the least cause for dependence on Parliament. The Church also was in passive submission to the throne, and owing to ignorance as also absence of moral elevation, the clergy were fast losing their influence.

Thus, all these causes had enabled the crown to recover its absolute supremacy; while, in the reign of Henry VIII, who had "crushed out" the old English freedom, "Parliament was at his feet" to do his bidding." Nay, even in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, there was the same increase of power in the crown, "which," an acknowledged

1 The Empire History. Edition 1891. p. 204.

2 Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. xviii p, 307 Ninth Edition.

Edward III. The Estates¹ appear to have deliberated separately, but delivered a collective answer to the King. The date of this event, however, has not been ascertained with any clearness. It may probably be A. D. 1351, or the early part of the king's reign.

I venture here, by the way, to respectfully invite the attention of the Reader to the fact that, while England claimed the *Three Estates of the Realm* only from the middle of the fourteenth century A. D., these —(*the Three Estates of the Vedic Empire*)—were known to the Hindus, and formed *a part and parcel of their polity and Self-Government* of the remotest Rig-Vedic period, centuries nay millenniums before the Christian Era. (*Vide ante pp 377, 325, 101 ;* Professor Bloomfield's remarks on *p 325 Foot-Note (c)*, and Mr. Tilak's observation in respect of our *inter-glacial civilization p. 101.*)

The Parliament now, had, to all appearances at any rate, assumed its present form. But, as a matter of fact, it was certainly far from enjoying the real power that it exercised subse-

1 (a) Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. xviii. Ninth Edition. *p 306.*

(b) *The Three Estates of the Realm* in Britain are (1) the Lords Spiritual, (2) the Lords Temporal, and (3) the Commons. The (4) *fourth Estate* is said to be the News-paper:press, or Jourualists. (*Vide Dr. Annandale's Concise Dictionary. Edition 1897. p 244*).

quently, or has been now exercising. For, the kings were still paramount, as all sought their favour, including even the nobles and the clergy; and, with the whole power in the hands of the kings, the legislation had become the prerogative of the crown rather than of the Parliament. In short, there was a total relapse of Parliamentary influence; and its life may be said to have expired with the close of the Wars of the Roses in A. D. 1485. For, the powerful baronage was decimated, and their vast estates were confiscated to the crown. The royal treasury thereby was enriched as a matter of course, and there remained no more, the least cause for dependence on Parliament. The Church also was in passive submission to the throne, and owing to ignorance as also absence of moral elevation, the clergy were fast losing their influence.

Thus, all these causes had enabled the crown to recover its absolute supremacy; while, in the reign of Henry VIII, who had "crushed out" the old English freedom, "Parliament was at his feet" to do his bidding." Nay, even in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, there was the same increase of power in the crown, "which," an acknowledged

1 The Empire History. Edition 1891. p. 204.

2 Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. xviii p, 307 Ninth Edition.

authority¹ tacitly admits, "probably never stood higher than it did in the reigns of Henry VIII and Elizabeth. The same authority also states that, "for a period of two hundred years, from the reign of Henry VI to that of Elizabeth, the free Parliaments of England were in abeyance." (Vol. xviii. p. 306).

In fact, the accession of the Tudors marks the period of absolute royal power which continued until the reign of Charles I; when another Civil War having broken out, it was brought to an end for ever. James I had, with lamentable short-sightedness, a series of struggles with the Commons, as he claimed to be above the law, holding the divine right of kings. But bringing to the scaffold King Charles himself, after the Civil War, and the subsequent deposition of James II, had proved the supreme power of the Commons during the period, although 'it also displayed the impotence of Parliament which had lost the confidence of the country, or was overborne by mobs, by an army, or by the strong will of a dictator'. It is especially very curious, even after the two revolutions, to see "the indirect methods by which the Commons were henceforth kept in subjection to the Crown

¹ Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. xi p. 12 Ninth Edition.

and the territorial aristocracy.”¹ For, we see that “the representation had long become an illusion,”¹ on account of bribery and other flagrant defects, which we shall advert to, presently; and the effective power of the state was wielded by the crown, the church, and the territorial aristocracy,² from the Revolution (A. D. 1688) till the reign of George IV. (A. D. 1820). Moreover, English history also tells us that, the Government of King George III, “was not ruling the country in accordance with the wishes of the people.” (Empire History. Edition 1891. p 370).

Probably, this was the order of the day, barring a few exceptions. For, the same history declares another fact thus : “One thing more we must not forget to notice as we read our history. For hundreds of years, our monarchs ruled just as they pleased, and kept most of the power in their own hands.” (*Vide* Empire History of England. (p 15. Edition 1891).

1 Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. xviii. p 308.

2 If the powerful Commons of England, said to be the *land of liberty*, were kept in subjection to the Crown and even to the Territorial Bureaucracy, is it to be wondered at that the Bureaucracy in India should have imposed upon her who has now lost her liberty, their irresponsible rule which had been admitted as such by experienced Indians, Anglo-Indians, and even British Statesmen ? (*vide ante* pp 291, 302—338),

This state of things was obviously owing to the defects in the *representation*, which have been admitted to be grave and notorious. A few instances, would, I think, not be out of place. "The knights of the shire were the nominees of nobles and great land-owners; the borough members were returned by the crown, by noble patrons, or close corporations; even the representation of cities, with greater pretensions to independence, was controlled by bribery. Nor were rulers content with their control of representation, but, after the Restoration, the infamous system of bribing the members themselves, became a recognized instrument of administration." * * *

"A narrow and corrupt electoral system,... the grave defects of the representation, were notorious; and some minor electoral abuses had been from time to time corrected. But, the fundamental evils,—nomination boroughs, limited rights of election,—though constantly exposed, long held their ground against all assailants. So far as 1770, Lord Chatham had denounced these flagrant abuses. 'Before the end of this century,' he said, 'either the Parliament will reform itself from within, or be reformed with a vengeance from without.' In 1782, and again in 1783, 1784, and 1785, his distinguished son, William Pitt, condemned the abuses of the

representation, and proposed schemes of Parliamentary Reform. In 1793 Mr. Grey (afterwards Earl Grey) submitted a motion on the same subject.*** Lord John Russel especially distinguished himself in 1820 and in several succeeding years, by the able *exposure of abuses* and by temperate schemes of reform. His efforts were assisted by the scandalous disclosures of bribery at Grampound, Penryn, and East Retford." (pp 308,309. *Ency. Br.* Vol. xviii. Ninth Edition).

But, all this notwithstanding, and even when the vital interests of Great Britain were jeopardized, all moderate proposals were rejected. Nay, there was even "an ill-timed declaration," from such an eminent person as the Duke of Wellington, in matters relating to, and seriously affecting, his own country, to the effect that, "the representation was perfect, and could not be improved." But, as good luck would have it, even this very thing precipitated the memorable crisis of Parliamentary reform, and the Reform Act became an accomplished fact in 1832.

Nay, even so late as the last year (1916), Lord Sydenham, the Ex-Governor of Bombay, had described the "General Election (of England, as [having been) carried on under our present barbarous conditions." (*Vide* The

Nineteenth Century And After, of December 1916. · p 1120).

Thus, while on the one hand, we see Britons nobly and bravely struggling for centuries for freedom of their race, for liberties of their own people, and for popular rights, on the other hand, we see deliberate attempts made by them to destroy the liberty of other human beings, by either purchasing, or forcibly seizing men and women, selling them as *slaves*, and making slavery but a regular traffic. History tells us that, "Master (afterwards Sir) John Hawkins coming upon the coast of Siera Leone, stayed for some time, and partly by the sword, and partly by other means, got into his possession three hundred negroes at the least," during the first voyage to the Guinea coast. He is remembered as "the first Englishman who ever seized and sold negroes as slaves. The regular course of the trade was for ships to repair first to the west coast of Africa for the human cargo obtained by fraud, violence, and the most inhuman means—and then to carry the Africans to the West Indies, and there barter or exchange them for silver, sugar, hides, &c." Hawkins was an English admiral in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and it is certainly very grievous to see this Englishman of *the land of liberty*, seizing and selling negroes as slaves. (*Vide* Empire & History of England. 2^d Edition 1891. pp 225, 226.)

As a matter of fact, however, we see the Slave Trade going on in England from the sixth century A. D., and it can be traced to the Anglo-Saxon period. Nay, Bristol had then, for a long time, become notorious for its Slave-Market; and English slaves from Britain were put up for sale even in the market-place of Rome, during the time of Pope Gregory of Rome, who had sent monk Augustine to Britain, for introducing Christian religion therein, A. D. 597. (*Vide supra p 402.*)

I would now place before the Reader another extract from the authority quoted above, as it gives some very shocking and heart-rending accounts of the Slave-Trade, persistently carried on for over two centuries by England, which has been proudly called the Land of Liberty. Says the historian: "The Slave-Trade, begun in Queen Elizabeth's reign, now came before Parliament for the first time (A. D. 1788). Horrible tales were told of how negroes were seized in Africa, packed in ships, and carried across the Atlantic to work as slaves in the West Indies and America. It is said that at the beginning of George the Third's reign, not less than 50,000 blacks were carried off every year in English ships. William Wilberforce brought in a bill, and tried to persuade Parliament to stop the slave-trade. But, the slave-merchants who

had their head-quarters in Liverpool, got the bill thrown out. It was eighteen years afterwards, before the slave-trade was abolished." (*Vide* Empire History of England. Edition 1891, p. 375).

It has been said that, "The Parliamentary government developed by England out of feudal materials has been deliberately accepted as the type of constitutional government all over the world." (*Vide* Ency. Br. 9th Ed. Vol. xi. p 12). It is, therefore, simply painful to see this august Assembly of the British nation, containing the very elite of Great Britain and Ireland, nay claiming the Three Estates of the Realm, quietly throwing out the Bill, brought before the body for redress of grievance and for suppression of the most ignominious Slave-Trade. The Bill was rejected owing to the pressure brought to bear upon the Parliament assembled, by the British merchants, interested in the Slave-Trade, without the least compunction and without caring a straw for the unbearable pangs of the sufferers. These were but *innocent* victims of physical strength which was grossly abused in every way without the least regard for moral law; and the only fault (if fault it could be called) of the captured slaves was that they were altogether helpless, were ignorant of the use of modern weapons, had no armours of the latest invention, and as

such, could neither protect nor defend themselves, nor could hold their own against the superior force, the most torturing seizures, nay, the most shameful and scandalous kidnappings of the civilized West.

The persons thus captured in Africa and carried off to America every year, at the rate of 50,000 per annum, were called slaves ; and it is needless to add that, they were treated as mere cattle, and obliged to work for their masters wherever sent, under most pitiable circumstances. (*Vide supra pp 418, 419; infra p 424*).

We have already noticed the very harsh treatment of slaves by the Greeks and the Romans (*supra pp 341, 363*), and while observing the fact that the mass of the slaves of the Romans, especially the agricultural slaves, were treated as mere cattle, English historians Liddell and Benecke remarked as follows :--
 " Englishmen feel a pang at seeing a fine horse consigned in his old age to the drivers of public carriages ; but, Romans wasted no such sympathy on slaves who had spent their lives and strength in cultivating their lands." (*Vide Liddell's History of Rome. New Edition. 1901. pp 340, 341*)

If then, Englishmen have had *such feelings even for cattle*, or say the lower order of creatures; it is in the very nature of things that they should have more sympathy for men, and keener

still *for innocent human beings, as also for their freedom*, and should, moreover, manifest greater anxiety for their sufferings, for their extreme agonies, and for the severe pain caused to them by tortures. But, the dominant interest of Self, the insatiable greed of gold, and the uncontrollable love of power over human souls, have, it seems, put an embargo on, or drowned the kind feelings of some Englishmen, and have perhaps even destroyed their sympathy for the sufferings of others. For, we see the Slave-Trade carried on by England not only from the reign of Queen Elizabeth, but it had its beginnings even in the Anglo-Saxon times or the sixth century (*ante pp* 401, 402), and was done away with, only in A. D. 1807, after persistent efforts were made by William Wilberforce, and he had struggled for full forty-five years continuously, to obtain freedom for the slaves. But, even after the abolition of the Slave-Trade in A. D. 1807, there were still 800,000 slaves under British rule or kept by Britain, and they were set free only after payment to the owners of the slaves £ 20,000,000 sterling, as compensation for the loss. Yet, with all this, the slaves were not allowed to leave their masters at once, as they were bound to work on for five years, on condition, however, that they were to be paid wages for their services.

I would now give here an extract from the work of Dr. Cunningham, as that will clearly and yet authoritatively explain why and how the Slave-Trade was carried on. Says he, "The ordinary Englishman of the 18th century simply regards the slave-trade as a great branch of the carrying-trade which gave employment to English shipping; the Assiento Treaties were a bargain with the Spanish Government by which England secured the sole right of importing slaves into the Spanish-Colonies; and there appears to be an entire want of huminitarian feeling on the subject." (*p.* 314).

"The total number of those who were thus exported from Africa, has been variously estimated. But, a writer who was professedly correcting exaggerations, and giving what appeared an unusually low estimate, put it at an annual average of 20,000 from 1680 to 1786. The trade had attained its highest pitch of prosperity, shortly before the commencement of the American War. Of the hundred and ninety-two English ships engaged in this trade in 1771, a hundred and seven sailed from Liverpool, fifty eight from London, twenty-three from Bristol, and four from Lancaster. The total export in a year of great activity was about 50,000." (*pp* 316,317).

Treatment of Slaves.

“The most serious evil in the condition of the West Indian Slaves was imposed by a British Act of Parliament (Geo. ii. c. 7), in the interest of the British creditors of the planters. In accordance with this Act, the home of the negro who had lived for years on an estate, might be suddenly broken, he himself sold to the continent, and his wife and children scattered. This was a matter of frequent occurrence, and could not be excused as an exceptional outrage, as might be argued in cases of severe flogging.” p 311. (Vide *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce, in Modern Times*. By W. Cunningham. D. D, Vol. ii. Edition 1892).

Obviously, this trade in human beings, or the purchase and sale of them, was deliberately allowed and carried on, simply for the sake of securing vested interests of those who, as Dr. Machichan remarked (infra p 433), profited by unrighteousness, by passing over lightly all moral obligations and principles, even with full knowledge of oppression caused by the slave-trade, and of tortures inflicted on the innocent victims on that account.

The same dismal tale appears to have been repeated in the *Indenture-System*,¹ which, by the bye, is only a "softened phrase for gross helotry," as Lady Mehta dubbed it. It was, in fact, but slavery in disguise, not to say a moral shame; and yet, it was allowed for decades together by the British Indian Government, which we Indians have always been in the habit of calling

1 "This system of indentured labour," as observed by the late Mr. Gokhale, "came into existence to take the place of slave labour, after the abolition of slavery. This is a fact admitted by every body, and Lord Sanderson's Committee whose report I have before me, put it in the very forefront of its report...The conscience of Government—and by Government I mean both the Government of India and the Imperial Government—has been very uneasy throughout, about this question, as may be seen from various inquiries, ...its (the system's) repeated suspension for abuses, and its reluctant resumption under pressure from planters...The system came into existence about the year 1834, after the abolition of slavery. In 1837, the matter attracted the attention of Parliament, and in the debate on the question that followed, the system was denounced in strong terms by Lord Brougham and Mr Buxton, and other great Englishmen of that time. The result was that the system was discontinued at once, and an enquiry was ordered into its nature and working." The Committee, that was appointed of four gentlemen and had sat at Calcutta, submitted a Majority and Minority report. "Three members out of four condemned the system altogether, and urged that it should not be allowed to come into existence again." And yet, the Parliament "adopted the minority report of one member, as against the majority report of three members...As a result of this vote, the system was allowed to be revived in the year 1842."...(Mr. Gokhale's speeches. Nateson's Vol.

of authentic materials and evidences, most carefully gleaned by Dr. Dâdâbhâi Nowroji in his Book entitled "Poverty and Un-British Rule in India." Edition 1901.

Truly has it been said by Mill that, under bureaucratic rule and despotic¹ governments, not representing the people, "the nation as a whole, and every individual composing it, are without

1 (a) Even prominent and well-known Anglo-Indians admit "the British Government of India (to be) the virtually despotic government of a dependency by a free people." (*Vide* Maine's *Village Communities in the East and West*. Edition 1890. p 233).

(b) Lord Macaulay says that, "India cannot have a free Government. But, she may have the next best thing—a firm and impartial despotism." (*Vide* Macaulay's *Life and Letters*. By the Rt. Hon. Sir G. O. Trevelyan, Bart M. P. Edition 1893. p. 287).

(c) Mr. Vincent A. Smith dubs the British Government of India as "benevolent despotism which now holds her (India) in its iron grasp." (*Vide The Early History of India*. Second Revised Edition. 1908. p 331).

(d) Dr. Dadâ Bhâi Nowroji also, while considering the British Bureaucratic system in India to be despotic, observes, "I need only say that the people of India have not the slightest voice in the expenditure of the revenue, and therefore in the good government of the country. The powers of the Government being absolutely arbitrary and despotic, and the Government being alien and bleeding, the effect is very exhausting and destructive indeed." (*Vide* *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India*. Edition 1901. p X.)

(e) While Sir John Malcolm pertinently remarks, "We are not warranted by the history of India, nor indeed by that

any potential voice in their own destiny. They exercise no will in respect to their collective interests. All is decided for them by a will not their own, which it is legally a crime for them to disobey. What sort of human beings can be formed under such a regime? What development can either their thinking or their active faculties attain under it?...Nor is it only in their intelligence that they suffer. Their moral capacities are equally stunted. Wherever the sphere of action of human being is artificially circumscribed, their sentiments are narrowed and dwarfed in the same proportion." (Vide Mill's *Representative Government*. Every Man's Library Edition. 1914. pp 203,204).

Our Rulers are certainly wise and shrewd enough to know these things in all their aspects. But, the interest of the ruling class often assert themselves, much to the detriment of the ruled, who thereby suffer irreparable injury to their moral and material welfare, which it should be the primary and sacred duty of the rulers to safe-guard, by all means in their power.

of any other nation in the world, in reckoning upon the possibility of preserving an Empire of such a magnitude by a system which excludes, as ours does, the Natives from every station of high rank and honourable ambition."... "The moral evil to us does not thus stand alone. It carries with it its Nemesis, the seeds of the destruction of the Empire: itself,"

In these circumstances, sympathetic care for the morals of the ruled, requisite concern in respect of the growth of intellect or development of the physique of the subject races, and proper attention to the desired formation of their character, become matters of very rare occurrence indeed, not to say even of indifferent solicitude and of no consideration at all.

Now, both the Government of India as well as of England were and have been alive to the great evils of the obnoxious Indenture-System (ante *p* 425); and as it caused the most depraved and shameful state of morals of the indentured labourers, the whole of the Indian population had got sick of the system, especially as they were the great sufferers in the matter, and were extremely disgusted with it.

And yet, the system was allowed to run its demoralizing course decade after decade, for eighty years, and even more. Nay, with all the horrible tales of the system, its utterly discouraging features, and the most exasperating circumstances placed before the Imperial Council with facts and figures on 4th March 1912, by Mr. Gokhale (ante *pp* 425, 426 Foot-note), Lord Chelmsford—the Viceroy—was pleased to declare (September 1916), that the system, disastrous though it was, must be continued until new con-

ditions have been worked out, in conjunction with the colonies concerned, for five years more.

This naturally caused not only much irritation and apprehension, but great indignation in India ; and even the Anglo-Indian mind seems to have been struck by the cruel attitude of the Government of India. For, *The Times of India* observed that, 'Five years is too long a period to allow a system so rightly detested and open to such abuses as have been exposed, to continue.' Thus, the Viceroy having entirely failed to understand the moral issue of the problem, the grave news of the Viceroy's declaration was certainly most alarming ; and the suspended abolition of the Indenture-System, could not be viewed by the Public of India with bated breath. It, accordingly, roused the whole of India to action from one end of the country to the other, and made her hear the clarion call of duty. Instantly (February 1917,) there was strong and incessant agitation, throughout the length and breadth of India, and even women had taken active part in it, for condemning the most revolting tragedies and horrid crimes, perpetrated at Fiji and other places, where the Indenture-system was or has been in force.

It was then, that Mr. Polak, in giving a rushing reply to the Viceroy's observations in re-

spect of increasing the Sex-ratio in the indentured labour, for only mitigating the evil, not for suppressing it altogether, had said that, the Government of India, instead of at once putting a stop to the abominable system, was "trying to adjust the economic interests of the planters to the moral conditions of the people of India" ! While, Sir Narayanrao G. Chandavarkar had observed, "Perish that industry and perish that commerce, if the wishes of women were to be trifled with for the sake of pelf."...Because, these women were treated like that, (that is, forced into prostitution), he felt that "our sisters, our mothers, and wives were being treated like that ; adding that, "the immoral savagery practised by the Fiji planters, (was) perhaps worse than the physical one of the modern Hun," and that, "on the day the State was allowed to trifle with the honour of women, under a system of indenture, and set aside their rights, on that was its day of doom." (*Vide supra p 427. Foot-note*).

Dr. Mackichan had truly said that, "It is no defence of slavery that numbers of slaves enjoy prosperity." In like manner, he rightly emphasized, "it is no defence of indentured labour that its victims found it advantageous," and further observed, "there are influences at work to represent the vested interests of those who

profit by unrighteousness." (*Vide* the Speeches made in the Mass Meeting held in Bombay for condemning the Indentured Labour, in February 1917).

Thus, on account of the Viceroy's ill-conceived utterances, in respect of the Indentured Labour, meant for announcing the intended extension of the period for further five long years (*vide ante pp* 430, 431), there was but timely, not to say very strong, and well-organized agitation throughout India, as stated above, and this had produced the desired effect. For, subsequently, in replying to the députation of the Ladies of India, the Viceroy had repeated (24th March 1917) what he had observed in his speech in the Imperial Council: 'It is difficult to conceive that a traffic of this sort once ended can be revived.' In the circumstances, we hope that the most disgraceful traffic has ended forever, never to revive any more, in any way.

But, the Report of the Inter-Allied Immigration Conference, recently held in London (September 1917), for considering the proposals for a new assisted system of Emigration to British Guiana, Trinidad, Jamaica, and Fiji, has, it appears, the flavour of the old *Indentured System*, which obviously was one of temporary slavery. True it is that, "His Majesty's Government in agreement with the Government of

India have decided that indentured emigration shall not be re-opened." Still, Mr. Gandhi, the great Indian patriot and passive resister of African fame, while discussing the Report, observed that, "stripped of all the phraseology under which the scheme has been veiled, it is nothing less than a system of indentured emigration." "In India itself," he continued, "if the scheme is adopted, we are promised a *revival* of the much dreaded depots and Emigration-Agents, all no doubt on a more respectable basis, but still of the same type, and capable of untold mischief."

Mr. Gandhi then makes an emphatic and very important statement, which evidently indicates the true opinion of the whole of India, and boldly declares as follows :—"So long as India does not in reality occupy the position of an equal partner with the Colonies, and so long as her sons continue to be regarded by Englishmen in the Colonies and English employers nearer home, to be fit only as hewers of wood and drawers of water, no scheme of emigration to the Colonies can be morally advantageous to Indian emigrants. If the badge of inferiority is always to be worn by them, they can never rise to their status, and any material advantage they will gain by emigrating can, therefore, be of no consideration." (*vide* Mr. M. K. Gandhi's Article on the subject, in the *Indian Review* for September 1917).

Obviously, in these circumstances, as observed by Mr. Gandhi, "Our difficulties¹ are as great as the *Himālayas*, but we have glorious forces at our disposal to meet them successfully. By employing means and methods out of the common will, we give peace to the world. By our Satva (*soul-power*), will we conquer the British nation. If we could not do this, the charge of having tarnished the fair name of our great ancestors would be rightly laid at our door. The English are enterprising and brave; but commercialism is their highest God. In the pursuit of wealth, they have not always paused to consider the purity or otherwise of the means employed. To imitate them in their evil ways must not be thought of. Let us have faith in our culture. This culture is superior to theirs."

I may also here respectfully venture to state in passing, that Bhārata-Varsha or Ancient India never knew, and had not the remotest idea of, the Indentured Labour System, which was but *slavery* in disguise, and which the British rulers had introduced into this country, simply to secure the interests of their white race, without ever paying due regard to, nay even at the sacrifice of, the morals of the subject-people, entrust-

1. Mr. Gandhi had made this remark during the course of his Presidential Address in the Gujrat Political Conference, held at Godhra on the 3rd November 1917.

ed to their care, although already forewarned of the probable evil consequences. (*vide supra pp 425-427*). Neither had Bhârata-Varsha ever known Slave-Trade at all, which by the bye, was in full swing in the civilized West,—in Greece and Rome, in the British Isles of the Anglo-Saxon times, and in England of the last three or about four centuries, in the West Indies, and America (*ante pp 363, 402, 418, 419*). Evidently, all this was done in open defiance of all moral obligations, tender feelings, or kindness to humanity; the only motive that had led to this most inhuman and detestable business, having been to secure vested interests of those who were desirous to profit by unrighteousness, and amass wealth by hook or crook and even by foul means. (*vide ante pp 423, 424*).

In Bhârata-Varsha, however, slavery as such there was none at all, much less Slave-Trade. For, in this respect, we have the reliable Greek evidence, viz. that of Megasthenes, who was for long time ambassador at the Court of Emperor Chandragupta Maurya. Megasthenes 'affirmed it to be a great thing in India, that all the Indians were free, and that no Indian slave existed.' (*Arrian Indika. Ch. 10.*)

Now, even if this statement of Megasthenes be supposed to be a generalization not warranted by facts, or to have been made on incorrect in-

formation, still, there are other facts which admit of no doubt, and which therefore even critical historians accept as sober truths. For, in the kingdom of Alör or Arör, the ancient capital of Sind, and now included in the district of Shikarpur, "the inhabitants," says Vincent A. Smith, "kept no slaves" (p 98). And again, in another place, the same historian observes that, "Slavery is said to have been unknown among the ancient Tamils." (p 398. Vide *The Early History of India*. Second Revised Edition. 1908).

But, even granting as Dr. T. W. Rhys Davids writes, that in India, "Besides...all freemen, there were also slaves : individuals had been captured in predatory raids and reduced to slavery, or had been deprived of their freedom as a judicial punishment ; or had submitted to slavery of their own accord. Children born to such slaves were also slaves ; and the emancipation of slaves is often referred to." Yet, he adds, "we hear nothing of such later developments of slavery as rendered the Greek mines, the Roman *latifundia*, or the plantations of Christian slave-owners, scenes of misery and oppression. For the most part, the slaves were house-hold servants, and not badly treated ; and their numbers seem to have been insignificant." (*Vide Buddhist India*. Second Impression. 1903. p 55).

This Hindu tender feeling for humanity seems to have become manifest in all its ramifications, asserting itself every where, not only during the most ancient period of our history, but also in later times, as we have the trustworthy evidence of even foreigners in that respect. For instance, Megasthenes—who was a Greek Ambassador at the court of Chandragupta for a considerable time, having recorded his experiences in this country, speaks of “No crime” in India, and further observes that, “theft is of very rare occurrence.” (Mac Crindle, *Fragment* xxvii).

Dr. Rhys Davids also observes in respect of crime in *Ancient India*, as follows :—“We hear of no crime, and there was not probably very much, in the villages themselves—each of them a tiny self-governed republic.” (*Vide Buddhist India*. Second Impression. 1903. p 21).

While, in respect of simplicity of our ancient life, the same writer remarks later on, that the villagers unite of their own accord, “to build Mole-halls and Rest-houses and reservoirs, to mend the roads between their own and adjacent villages, and even to lay out parks. And it is interesting to find that women are proud to bear a part in such works of Public utility.” (p 49. *Vide* also Jât i. 199).

“The economic conditions in such villages were simple. None of the house-holders could

have been what would now be called rich. On the other hand, there was a sufficiency for their simple needs, there was security, there was independence. There were no land-lords, and no paupers. There was little of any crime"... "The people, pleased one with another and happy, dancing their children in their hands, dwelt with open doors." (p 49, and Dialogues of the Buddha. i. 176).

"They were proud of their standing, their family, and their village." (Buddhist India. p 51).

Now, as regards our ever kind feeling even in modern times, we have also the reliable testimony of the great historian and statesman Lord Elphinstone, corroborated by statistical facts. Says he, "Including Thags and Dacoits, the mass of crime in India is less than in England." "Thags are almost a separate nation, and Dacoits are desperate ruffians,...but the remaining part of the population (of India) is little given to such passions, as disturb society." (Vide Elphinstone's History of India. Vol. I. Second Edition. 1843. p 385).

The same statesman and historian further states that, "The Hindus are mild and gentle people, more merciful to prisoners than any other Asiatics. Their freedom from gross debauchery is the point in which they appear to most advan-

tage ; and their superiority in purity of manners is not flattering to our self-esteem. (Do. Do. pp 388, 389).

Lord (Warren) Hastings also thus speaks of the Hindus in general :—" They are gentle and benevolent, more susceptible of gratitude for kindness shown them, and less prompted to vengeance for wrongs inflicted, than any people on earth ; faithful, affectionate, submissive to legal authority." (*Vide* India. What Can it Teach us ? Edition 1883. p 60).

One more thing in the course of comparison, for doing justice to Islam polity, as some ignorance and misunderstanding seem to have prevailed ; in respect of the existence of Democracy in the Mohomedan world. I would, therefore, give here an extract from an Article written by Professor Feroz-Ud-Din of Aligarh College, in the *Muslim India and Islamic Review*, and quote the very words of Caliph Umar. Says the latter:-

" My Brothers ! I owe you several duties, and you have several rights over me. One of them is that you should see that I do not misuse the revenue ; another, that I may not adopt wrong measures in the assessment of the revenue ; that I should increase your salaries ; protect the frontiers ; and that I should not involve you in unnecessary dangers. Whenever I err, you have a right to stop and to take me to task."

The Professor, after giving the aforesaid quotation, observes thus : "That the great Caliph, during his whole regime, kept these words to their very spirit, is above every criticism."

These democratic principles in respect of political matters, however, do not seem to have had a long life, and perhaps died away with, or subsequent to, their originators, although in matters of Mahomedan religion, they had spread far and permanently enough.

Lastly, I would advert to the Jury or the Panchâyat system of the Hindu Polity, to which I had only made a passing reference before (*ante pp.* 195-198). Here, however, it seems necessary to give further requisite details in respect of the system, as even among much advanced, nay well-read, literate, and talented Hindus, supposed to have had more general knowledge than others of our sacred Scriptures (श्रुति) and remembered Traditions (स्मृति), there appears enormous ignorance in respect of the latter, and more so as regards the former.

Moreover, deliberate or at any rate unguarded attempts appear to have been sometimes made, to explain things contained in these most important and ancient documents, in an off-hand manner, or to make reckless statements in regard to them, as if with the knowledge of an expert and the decision of an authority. These,

owing to incorrect information, ignorance of facts, and absence of corroborative evidence, have naturally proved to be erroneous and even contrary to facts, as will be presently shown ; and yet, they pass as Gospel truths, owing to the high position of those that make them. In the circumstances, it becomes incumbent to bring to light the palpable errors that seem to have crept therein ; as otherwise, these, if they pass unnoticed, will be taken for granted as but undisputed facts.

We have already seen that the Jury or *the Panchayat System* of India has received but scant recognition at the hands of British Government (*vide ante p 264 Foot note 1*) ; and to this may be added the fact that last year (1916), the Honourable Sir Mahâdevrao Choubal made a speech in the Bombay Legislative Council, by observing that, " the so-called right of trial by Jury is not a right which is of the essence of any indigenous system of administration of justice in the country before the advent of British Rule. It is purely a British Institution based on representative ideas, and engrafted upon a foreign soil."

But, with all deference to the learned Councillor, we assure the Reader that this is altogether far from truth, and that, the [Honourable Sir Mahâdevrao] Choubal's assertion, that

the *Jury system in India is purely a British Institution and engrafted upon a foreign soil*, is simply gratuitous, and not at all warranted by facts. We shall therefore at once proceed to refute his statement, by proving that the Jury-plant of the Indian Polity is *neither exotic nor of foreign growth, but indigenous in India*, and had its natural growth in the innate juridical mind of our nation and the condition of the country.

In the Hindu Polity, as will be easily perceived from our Smriti Codes, there is a distinct mention of *Jurors* or Panchas, i. e. laymen-counsellors representing respectable¹ men (सभ्यैः¹), corporate² bodies (पूगाः²), guilds² (अणयः²), Assemblies³ (कुलानि), Committees³ (गणाः³), &c, for assisting the King or the Judge in administering justice, civil as well as criminal (व्यवहारः³ विधौ); and Smritis abound in allusions to the Hindu Jury-System, which, as we shall presently show, was in full swing during Hindu Sovereignty in India, from the earliest times down to the latest period, or the fall of the Marâthâ Empire in A. D. 1818, and subsequently. Nay, even now, the vestiges of the system are found here and there. But, owing to want of support from the paramount power, the system has been dwindling into decay, in the very nature of things. (*Vide ante pp 19, 20, 264 Foot-note*).

1 Manu (viii. 10). 2 Yâjñavalkya (ii. 30). 3 Nârada (i. 7.)
Vide Jolly's Edition.

Be that as it may, the system has certainly been indigenous in India, and we have been habituated to it from time immemorial. Moreover, every possible care was taken by our Hindu rulers to foster its growth ; especially, as it had proved advantageous to all, and had, as such, attracted the attention of even foreigners. For, we find that Sir Mount Stuart Elphinstone, while reporting on the state of the territories conquered from the Peshwas, had written as follows, in respect of the working of the system : “ All accounts agree, it must be owned, in representing the knowledge of the common people, in the customary law of their country ; and consequently, the uniformity of their decisions when formed into Pancháyats, is far beyond what could be expected.”

“ The advantage of this was particularly felt among the lower orders, who are most out of reach of their rulers, and most apt to be neglected under all Governments. By means of the Panchayats,¹ they were enabled to effect a tolerable dispensation of justice among themselves.” ...

¹ *Panchayat system* is a system of administering justice by means of Panchas or laymen-counsellors, who represent respectable men, guilds, corporations, &c., of a village or town. These are appointed for assisting the King.

With these preliminary observations, we shall proceed to trace the origin and antiquity of our Panchâyat or the Jury-system in Bhâratavarsha. Our most ancient and

or the Judge, in the administration of justice, civil or criminal.

Akin to this, is the Jury System of England. It therefore seems desirable to give the definition and the features of it, for purposes of comparison.

"The Jury are a body of Laymen, selected by lot to ascertain, under the guidance of a Judge, the truth in questions of fact arising either in civil litigation or in a criminal process. They are generally twelve in number and their verdict, as a general rule, must be unanimous. Their province is strictly limited to questions of fact, and within that province they are still further restricted to the exclusive consideration of matters that have been proved by evidence in the course of the trial. They must submit to the direction of the judge as to any rule or principle of law that may be applicable to the case; and even in deliberating on the facts, they receive, although they need not be bound by, the directions of the judge, as to the weight, value, and materiality of the evidence submitted to them. Further, according to the general practice, they are selected from the inhabitants of the locality, whether county or city, within which the cause of action has arisen, or the crime has been committed, so that they bring to the discharge of their duties, a certain amount of independent local knowledge, an element in the institution which is by no means to be ignored. (*Vide* Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. xiii. Ninth Edition. pp 783, 784).

authoritative Lawgiver is Manu.¹ Yet even his Code known as *Manu Smṛiti*, as also the *Smṛitis* of Parāshara, Yājñavalkya, Brihaspati, Nārada, and others, have their precursors, and presuppose the existence of *Shrauta* (श्रौत), *Grihya* (गृह्य), and *Sāmaya-chārīka* (सामयाचारिक) *Sūtras*, which, as a matter of fact, give a detailed account and very faithful picture of our every-day-life, during

1 (a) As to the age of Manu, see ante p 194 and Foot-Notes. Max Duncker accepts 600 B. C. as the date at which Manu's Code must have been written down and put together. (*Ancient History of India*. By Professor Max Duncker. p 195. Edition 1881).

(b) Thus, although there is much dispute as regards the antiquity of Manu, still the past *Smṛitis* or the traditions, of which he treats, and on which the Code is based, go very far into antiquity. (*Vide infra* Foot-Note c, d, e, and p 447).

(c) Whatever the date of Manu—the Lawgiver, there is no doubt, in respect of the antiquity of our Dharma-Sūtras or Mānavadharma Shāstra. The former are also called *Sāmaya-chārīka* Sūtras, and form a third part to the *Shrauta* and *Grihya* Sūtras, while reference to the latter is often made in the *Mahā Bhārata*.

(d) As regards the antiquity of the Epic in which the reference occurs, Barth remarks : “the Hindu Epic is ancient, as ancient in the origin as the earliest traditions of the nation.” (*Indian Antiquary*. 1895. p 71).

(e) Moreover, in respect of the age of the Sūtras, Max Muller says that, “the Vedic Literature in its three well-defined periods, the Mantra, Brāhmaṇa, and Sūtra periods, goes back to at least a thousand years before our Era.” (*India. What can it Teach us ?* Ed. 1883. p 207).

the early period, in all matters, whether religious, ceremonial, social, judicial, political, or academic.

We have already referred to the antiquity of the Sûtra works (ante p 446 Foot-note e); and I may venture to state here, that some of these contain references even to very ancient *traditions* or Smritis (स्मृति). As for instance, in the Anupada Sûtra, which Max Muller reckons amongst the earliest specimens of this kind of literature, we have श्रुतिस्मृतिद्वयसंपन्नैः । (ii. 4); while, the following also occurs in the Nidāna Sûtra:—
आचार्य स्मृतीनां । याज्ञिकाः स्मृतौ । (ii. 1).

But, more than this, there appear grounds to suppose, as admitted even by Max-Muller (*Vide* his History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature. Ed. 1859. p 107), that there existed, even previous to the Sûtra works, a body of literature propagated by oral traditions (स्मृति), and forming the basis of all later writings, whether sacred or profane, religious or domestic. Obviously, this was in the Brâhmana period ; and we find the name of Smṛiti occurring even in the Taittirîya Âranyaka : स्मृतिः प्रत्यक्षमेतिह्यं । अनुमानश्चतुष्टयं । १. २. १.). Here, the Commentator explains Smṛiti by अनुमेयश्रुतिमूलं मन्वादिशास्त्रं । meaning thereby “ the laws of Manu and others, whose source is revelation, the existence of which must be inferred.”

Thus, it will be vividly perceived that the roots of Smṛiti or traditional knowledge which, as we

have seen, has been varied and also very extensive, have gone far deep into even the Vedic ground, and have moreover proved thereby not only its great antiquity, but also the fact that it has been the *prime-source* of other Smritis, such as the Smriti of Manu or Yâjñavalkya, of Nârada or Brihaspati, and of others.

Now, beginning with Manu, we find that in matters of administering justice, whether in civil suits or criminal¹ proceedings, he has stated the law to the effect that the King shall investigate law-cases either in person (Manu Smriti. viii. 10), or shall cause them to be investigated by a learned judge appointed for the purpose (viii. 11). But, whoever the Judge, he must always be assisted by Counsellors or Panchas, that is, Jurors and Assessors. (*Vide ante p 195*).

Yâjñavalkya also has in his स्मृति laid down that, "In all legal proceedings, representa-

1 (a) Says Professor Macdonell: "It may, therefore, reasonably be conjectured that the royal power of jurisdiction steadily increased; the references in the Shata-Patha Brâhmana to the King, as wielding punishment (Danda), confirm this supposition. (*Vide Vedic Index. i. pp 391,392*).

(b) Nârada Smriti declares King as the Fountain-head of Justice. (iii. 6):—धर्ममूलश्च पार्थिवः ।

tives of Corporate Bodies (पूजाः), Guilds (श्रेणयः), Assemblies (कुलानि), as also of Committees (गणाः), should be appointed by the King,¹ for helping the administration of justice (व्यवहारविधौ).

Nārada again declares that, श्रेणयः, कुलानि, गणाः, as also any officer appointed by the King, and the King himself, are empowered to decide cases whether civil or criminal (*Vide* Nārada Smṛiti i. 7). While, later on, the same Smṛiti directs that, 'the King should appoint as members of the Court of Justice (1) honourable men, and (2) persons of tried integrity that are able to bear like good bulls the burden of the administration of justice.' (iii. 4).

But, more than this, Brihaspati, in his Smṛiti, gives a detailed account in respect of the sources of justice and its administration, of Jurors and their powers, of itinerant courts and decision by arbitration. Says Brihaspati: "A

¹ दृष्टेनाधिकृताः पूजाः श्रेणयोऽन्यकुलानि च । पूर्वं पूर्वं गुरुज्ञेयं व्यवहारविधौ वृणाम् ॥ (१-१०). The celebrated Commentator Vijnāneshvara explains "पूज" as a body of men belonging to different castes, following different professions, and residing in the same place, such as village or town; श्रेणी as a body of men consisting of persons of the same or different castes, and following different professions, such as vendors of betel leaves, oil-mongers, shoe-makers, &c.; कुलानि as kinsmen and brethren, or associates.

Bráhmaṇa is the root of the tree of Justice ; the sovereign prince is its stem and branches ; the ministers its leaves and blossoms ; and just Government its fruit." (i. 34). He then describes the duties of different Courts as follows:—
 "The Chief Justice decides causes ; the King inflicts punishments ; the judges investigate the merits of the case" (i. 6.). The number of Judges varied. Manu held one Judge with three Jurors, sufficient to form a Court (viii. 10, 11). Chánakya was of opinion that three officers of State with three Jurors or learned persons were sufficient for the purpose (*Artha-shāstra* Bk. III. Ch 1). According to Shukra Nîti, the Judge and the Jurors were together to be of uneven number, that is, seven, five, or three. (ii. 96).

To this may be added the fact that apart from these Courts, each village had its own local Court, for deciding minor civil cases, criminal offences of trivial nature, such as petty thefts, and disputes about village boundaries. The village Court was composed of the Headman of the place, accompanied by respectable elders, who served as Panchas in the case. The decision in each case was in accordance with the opinion of the majority of the Panchas, the village Court having had power to inflict small fines, and to restore or transfer possession.

Thus, there appears no doubt whatever that the net-work of local Courts had spread all through-

out our Ancient Hindu Empire. Nay, even the idea of the system of local courts for the speedy disposal of cases and convenience of all, seems to have taken very deep root in the minds of the people. And evidently, on account of this reason, Brihaspati has also gone so far as to propound in his Smṛiti that, "for persons roaming in the forest, a Court should be held in the forest, for warriors in the camp, and for merchants in the caravan" (i. 25). But, more than this, the establishment of itinerant Courts seems to be an accomplished fact, from a Ceylon Inscription, as we learn from a passage therein, that itinerant Judges actually used to visit different parts of the island for inspecting the work of administration of justice, and even for disposal of cases. (*Vide* Epigraphia Zeylanica, Vol. i. No. 21).

The passage in respect of itinerant Courts runs thus :—"Should the inhabitants of these Dasagāṃ (group of ten ?) villages have transgressed any of the rules stated (above), the royal officials who go annually (on circuit) to administer justice (in the country) shall..."

Another Inscription, known as the Vevalakatiya Slab Inscription of Mahinda IV (1026-1042 A. D.), throws quite a flood of light on the system of administration of justice in Ceylon, as it shows that within the Dasagāma, justice was

administered by means of a Communal Court, composed of headmen and responsible householders of the village, subject of course to the authority of the King in Council. This court had the power to try all cases, and to inflict even the extreme punishment of death. (*Vide Epigraphia Zeylanica. Vol. 1. No. 21*).

There is, moreover, another fact which deserves notice ; and it is this, viz. that the heavy work of recognised Courts was in a great measure lightened by arbitrators ; as, all cases, except those relating to violent crimes, could be decided by arbitration, by guilds of artisans, assemblies of co-habitants, meetings of religious sects, and by other bodies duly authorised by the King. (*Vide Brihaspati Smriti. I. 28*). In fact, the Arbitration-system has the great advantage and merit of giving substantial relief to the disputants, preventing thereby ruinous litigation. Nārada also has, for this reason, rightly observed in his Smriti thus : ‘ In disputes among merchants, artisans, or the like persons, and in disputes concerning persons that subsist by agriculture or dyeing, it is impossible for outsiders to pass a sentence ; and the passing of the sentence must, therefore, be entrusted to persons acquainted with such matters, in cases of like nature.’

Thus, all these things go to prove that during Hindu Sovereignty, Representatives of

different castes and creeds, professions and trades, guilds and corporations, used to form Pancháyats, and these decided civil and criminal cases that came before them, with the King's Officer, having had due regard to the merits and importance of each case. (ante pp. 448, 449). Nay, they also prove the great antiquity of the Pancháyat-system or the administration of justice by means of the Judge and the Jury, which has come down to us not only from the Code of Manu, but its precursors—the oldest *Smritis*—or Remembered Traditions, to the probable antiquity of which I have already made requisite reference (ante pp. 446, 447). As, however, the system seems to have been in vogue not only in ancient but even during the latest times, it seems desirable to place before the Reader the necessary information in respect of its continuity.

The dates of composition of the *Smritis*, from which the aforesaid quotations have been made, range from before the Christian Era to the sixth century A. D. The most authoritative law-work in Mahārāshtra has been *Mitāksharā* which is a commentary on Yājñavalkya's *Smṛiti* by Vijnāneshwar, who seems to have flourished about the Shaka Era 968 or A. D. 1076. There is also one more commentary on Yājñavalkya's *Smṛiti* by Aparārka, written about the year 1109 A. D., or the twelfth century.

From these Smritis and the commentaries thereon, it appears but evident that the system of administration of justice by means of the Judge and the jury of respectable persons, nay even of Representatives of corporate bodies like the *Pûga* (पूग), *Shreni* (श्रेणि), *Kula* (कुल), *Gana* (गण), and the like (ante p 443), were in full swing during those times and subsequently, nay even down to the middle of the nineteenth century, in respect of which there is overwhelming evidence that will be presently produced. And yet, these invaluable institutions which had continued so long, and which had moreover, a grandeur of their own, have been allowed to pass away, their disintegration and destruction having been attributed to British dominion, as admitted even by Anglo-Indians. (*Vide* ante pp 19, 20, 264 Foot-note).

The anxiety of our ancient Ancestors for giving real and impartial justice to all concerned, and their talents for devising means for that end, may be seen from the fact that bodies like the *Gota Sabhá* (गोतसभा), *Deshaka Sabhá* (देशकसभा), *Brahma-Sabhá* (ब्रह्मसभा), *Rāja-Sabhá* (राजसभा), *Dharma-Sabhà* (धर्मसभा), &c., were in existence for administering justice with the assistance of respectable persons selected from among the people; and the decisions (महज्जर-Mahajars)

of these Sabhâs or others, were distinguished by the name of Gota-Mahajar (गोतमहजर), Deshaka Mahajar (देशक महजर), &c, or were known as Nivâdâ Patras (निवाडा-पत्रें), Nirnaya Patras (निर्णयपत्रें), Yajita Patras (यजितपत्रें), Jaya-Patras (जयपत्रें), &c.

The constitution and functions of these bodies may be stated thus, in brief :—The Gota-Sabhâ was an assembly of villagers formed for the purpose of deciding disputes, and included the Patil of the village, Kulkarni who was also a Joshi, and Balotedars, viz. the barber, potter, goldsmith, carpenter, shoemaker, Mahâr, and Mâng, who were the hereditary servants of the village community. In addition to these, Shets and Mahâjans, i. e. traders and gentry of the village, had also a right to sit and take part in the Assembly. All disputes in the village were referred to this Assembly, and its decision was considered to be of paramount importance, as without it, even the King's decision was not considered as binding. The Gota-Mahajar (गोतमहजर), or the decision of the original suit or complaint, was reduced to writing, and was signed by the Pâtil, who was also called Mukâdam or Naikwâdi (नाईकवाडी), the Kulkarni, Balotedars, Shets, and Mahâjans, who had taken part in the matter. It may here be remarked in passing, that the number of persons who were to take part in the Gota (गोत) Assembly, having

not been fixed, it was sometimes more or less, according to circumstances.

The *Deshaka Sabhā* (देशकसभा) which comprised *Deshmukhs*, *Deshpāndes*, *Pátils*, *Shets*, and *Mahājans*, was in fact, an Appellate Court, superior to the *Gota Sabhā*. It had authority to take evidence and decide questions of law as well as of facts. Its decision, known as *Deshaka Mahajar* (देशक महजर) was signed by persons present, and sealed.

Judicial officers appointed by the King, also tried suits and complaints. But, even these were always assisted by Jurors ; and the decision given by the tribunal was called *Rāja Mudrā* (राजमुद्रा), as it had the seal of the Government Officer that administered justice.

The highest appellate authority was the King, whose decision was final. He, however, adjudicated cases, accompanied by *Deshmukhs*, *Deshpāndes*, *Pátils*, *Kulkarnis*, and the Ministers of State.

After the rise of the *Marāthā* Power, and the subsequent enormous extension of the *Maratha* Empire, the words such as सभ्याः (Jurors), पूगाः (Corporate Bodies), गोटसभा (Village-Jury), देशकसभा (Grand Jury), &c., fell into disuse, and in their place came in vogue the expressions *Panchas* and *Panchāyats*, which have been so very popu-

lar and familiar to us, and which were in full swing during the Maratha Rule, nay have been so even now, as will be seen from a few instances given in the sequel (*infra pp* 458, 459).

I have already given the nature and functions of the English Jury (*ante p* 445). Comparing this with the Hindu Jury-System as it obtained in former times, the Reader will have easily perceived that there is vast difference between the two ; and it will have to be specially borne in mind that while the foreign Jury-system, introduced but partially into India after the advent of British rule in the country, has been made applicable here, only in criminal cases, and that too in a certain class of cases and in certain districts, our Panchas or Jurors with the assistance of the Judge or the King's Officer, tried, during Hindu Sovereignty in India, cases of all sorts, both *civil* and *criminal*. For the conviction of the Reader, I would here quote an order, issued by the Sovereign-Power in India—the Peshwas, in A. D. 1782-83, to the following effect. “The Taluka officer should receive all civil disputes relating to Watan, &c., and hand them over to the Judge for adjudication. The Judge should record the statements of the parties and the evidence of witnesses, and should decide with the assistance of five independent persons, after explaining the matter to the Taluka officer....The Pancháyat

should consist of four Jamindars who should be men of pure character, and conversant with law." (*Vide* Selections. Satara Kings' and Peshwas' Diaries. Vol. viii. pp 128,129. Ed. 1911).

Moreover, Pratâpsimha Mahârâj, the last of the Satara Kings, had prepared in A. D. 1836, a Code of procedure and of rules relating to (a) adoption, (b) inheritance, (c) partition, &c., and this, while discussing administration of Justice, observes, (1) 'It is a very good and laudable practice that in our territories disputes are settled by the parties amongst themselves or with the help of Panchâyats. (2) The decisions of Panchâyats and Arbitrators will be upheld by Government, as binding. (3) The Pâtîl of every village should call a Panchâyat whenever any dispute in the village is brought to him for disposal. (4) When the dispute is serious, and the parties concerned do not like to have it decided by the Village-Panchâyat, it should be referred to the Mamledar, who should appoint requisite Panchas for deciding the matter. (5) In large cities and towns, the disputes should be referred to the Panchâyat consisting of Shets and Mahâjans, that is, traders and respectable persons.'

Now, let us see with what powers the Panchas were invested; whether they were allowed to decide even serious cases such as murder, &c., and whether their decision was held

by Government as binding on all parties concerned. It appears from the Peshwas' Diaries that during Maratha Sovereignty, Náráyanji Patil and Kabâji Patil of Rajetakli in Parganna Beed, having committed murder of one Krishnâji Pátîl of Pádli in Parganna Ambad, the complainants and the two accused had requested the Government to appoint Panchas, and to have the case decided by them. The parties having agreed to abide by the decision of the Panchas, these were appointed, and the decision was given as shown below (A. D. 1750-51):—

“Fine of Rs. 2,001 (as per deeds of consent), to be levied from the two accused, in two equal instalments (Rs. 1,000 + Rs. 1001 = Rs. 2,001).

So much then, as regards the prevalence of the Panchâyat or the Jury-System in Northern and Central India, and even in Mahārāshtra. But, more than this, it seems to have obtained also in Southern India. For, the records of the administration of Chola Emperors distinctly indicate that the Panchâyat or the Jury System was in full swing under their Regime (A. D. 907-1318), as shown before (p 197.)

Thus, it will be perceived that, the Hindu Jury-System or the *Pachâyat* form of administering justice, with its gradual development in the usual course, was decidedly a great achieve-

ment of Hindu juridical mind, and has always been found even from very ancient times to be of great importance and immense practical utility, in all our affairs of dispute, either great or small, occasional or of every day occurrence; and there are obvious reasons to believe that this system had spread from East to West like other knowledge. For, owing to constant communication between the East and the West, not to say owing to our 'emigrations from Bhâratavarsha—our mother-country, and the establishment of our Colonial Empire² in distant parts of Asia and Europe, Africa and America, even in very ancient times, it seems probable in every way, that the knowledge of our religion and philosophy, customs and usages, morals and polity, had spread along with our colonies in the West. Bhâratavarsha, accordingly, had enjoyed the unique honour and privilege of having had the 'Egyptian, Hebrew, Greek, and Roman legislation inspired by Manu' the hero of our Land. And M. Louis Jacolliot further adds that, Manu's "spirit still permeates the whole economy of our European laws." (*Vide ante pp 3,102,352*). I may here also venture to state that Egypt was an entire Indian emanation (*ante p 297*).

1 *Vide the Author's Âryāvartīc Home and its Arctic Colonies.*

2 *Âryāvartīc Home. Chapter xiv. pp. 369-428.*

Foot-note) ; and Thales,¹ Pythagoras, as well as Plato of Greece, were the disciples of the philosophers² of India.

But, we stand on still more *terra firma* and historical ground, when we come to the fourth Century B. C., and the subsequent period ; as the invasion of Alexander the Great and his campaigns in India, had brought the West in

1 Thales was born in B. C. 640, Pythagoras in B. C. 580, and Plato in B. C. 429.

Thales is said to have travelled and acquired knowledge in Egypt. He was regarded as the founder of Greek philosophy. Pythagoras had also visited Egypt and other countries of the East, for acquiring knowledge. Plato had undertaken extensive travels for the same purpose. (Sir Win. Smith's History of Greece. Edition 1900. pp 140, 142, 591).

2 Tod says " that these were sages, whose systems of philosophy were the prototypes of those of Greece: to whose works Plato, Thales, and Pythagoras were disciples." " Where shall we find," he further adds, " the astronomers (of India), whose knowledge of the planetary system yet excites wonder in Europe, as well as the architects and sculptors, whose works claim our admiration, and the musicians, who could make the mind oscillate from joy to sorrow, from tears to smiles, with the change of modes and varied intonation." (Vide Tod's Rājasthān. Vol. i. pp 522, 523; and Valmiki Rāmāyana, the oldest Epic in existence).

3 Apart from their effect on communication, these campaigns, by the bye, had made no impression whatever on our people, but simply caused cruel wounds of a horrible war, inflicted on a *brave yet peace-loving* nation, for no other purpose than for the sake of self-aggrandizement and reckless ambition that knew no bounds. No Indian author, therefore, makes the least reference either to Alexander or to his deeds. India remained altogether unchanged. Or, to quote Mathew Arnold :—

" The East bowed low before the blast
In patient deep disdain,
She let the legions thunder past
And plunged in thought again."

close contact with the East. Besides, the vast extent of the Empire of Chandragupta to the West of the Indus, the surrender by Seleukos to the Emperor, of a large part of Ariana still further west, the cession of the satrapies of Paropanisadai (Kâbul), Aria (Herat), Arachosia (Kandahâr), as also Gedrosia almost upto the confines of Persia, and the matrimonial alliance brought about by Seleukos, by giving his daughter to Emperor Chandragupta, had effected rapid progress in the desired intercourse between the West and the East.

Moreover, the embassy of Megasthenes in the Court of the Emperor (302 B. C.), had enabled the ambassador, who had resided for a considerable time in the capital of the Indian Empire, which was then Pâtaliputra or Pâtânâ, to become acquainted with the particulars of the administration of India; and he having properly utilised his time, had supplied his country, and through it the continent of Europe, with the requisite details in respect of the geography, products, and religious, social, or political institutions of India. These details now exist only in fragments which, however, were collected and edited by Schwanbeck under the title of *Megasthenis Indika* (1846,) and translated by McCrindle (1877). But, with all this, the information, as regards the polity and Self-Government in India, was available in Greece and

other parts of Europe, through Megasthenes, even in the third century B. C., and subsequently.

Within the Empire of Chandragupta, there were large and populous cities like Pâtaliputra, which having had Municipal Boards or Committees, these were most carefully noted by Megasthenes (ante pp 159, 160, 450). The Boards, as remarked by Vincent A. Smith, were obviously but an official development of the ordinary non-official *Panchâyats* or Committees of five members, by means of which all our castes and trades, guilds and corporations in India, have been accustomed to regulate their internal affairs of all sorts, from time immemorial. Thus, having had due regard to all these facts and circumstances, it seems that our Jury-system,¹ excellent as it is, seems to have been adopted by nations in other parts of the world in some form or other, with necessary alterations and modifications in it, as suited the requirements and convenience of each ; although, England boastfully declares it to be ' the famous judicial institution, the development of which is generally regarded as one of the greatest achievements of English jurisprudence.' (*Vide* Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. xiii. Ninth Edition. p 784). England, however, can by no

¹ Even Sir Thomas Munro in his Minute of 1825 admits ' the innate excellence of the Institution.' (*Vide* also supra p 264. Foot-note).

means lay claim to any originality in the matter, or even to the boast that the Jury-system is the birth-right of Englishmen, as will be seen from facts which we shall place before the Reader, and which have shed more light on the subject than the mere theory that a few writers have advanced, to solve the question of the origin of the Jury-system, by observing that "forms of trial, resembling the Jury-system in various particulars, are to be found in the primitive institutions of all nations." (*Vide Encyclopædia Britannica*. Vol. xiii. Ninth Edition. p 784).

The Reader perhaps remembers what Mr. S. Krishnaswami Iyengar, M. A., has remarked. He says that, "the Jury-system... is believed to be the birth-right of Englishmen, and spoken of generally as unknown to India." Fortunately, however, he has exploded this deep and most destructive prejudice, and brought to light the prodigious ignorance of many on the one hand, and the very instructive and real knowledge of the fact on the other, by saying that, "the (Jury) system... is found to have been in full swing," in India; and Vincent A. Smith also speaks, in his *Early History of India*, of the considerable administrative and judicial powers, exercised by the Village Assemblies under the supervision of the Crown officials. (*Vide ante p 197*).

Thus, it will be seen from details given before (*supra pp 446 et seque*) that, the Jury-system had its precursors in India, where it was in full swing in all the parts of the great continent, from very early times, as already shown, and even before other nations had any idea of, or become acquainted with it. Obviously, Britain was very late in the day in introducing the system in the island, owing to its very savage and backward state in the early period of its history, its want of literature and absence of knowledge, its incapacity and unpreparedness, its unsympathetic foreign rule for centuries, and also other causes, which I need not recapitulate here.

Perhaps, it will be sufficient to state that, England had no stable Government at all for many centuries, before the Norman Conquest. The Romans, who were the first invaders and Conquerors of Britain, had made it a Roman province, and this remained under the yoke of Rome for over four hundred years, uptil A. D. 410. The natives of Britain were in a savage state at first ; and though the Romans had made some improvements in the island, still owing to the wholesale massacre of the Druids with whom had died the literature of the country (whatever it was), the constant struggle of the Romans for supremacy, their deeds of shameful wrongs or insults, relentless persecutions for the Cross and for other reasons, the Roman rule was

said to be but grim dark before the dawn: And subsequent to the withdrawal of the Roman garrison, England fell an easy prey to all sorts of raids and invasions of the Northern foes—the Picts and the Scots, to the North-Sea pirates—the Saxons, the Angles, the Jutes, the Danes, to the Norsemen, and to the Normans. All had come in turn and devastated the country as cruel masters or rather usurpers, endeavoured to establish their rule, until ousted by another still more powerful usurper. (ante pp 387, 399-402, *The Empire Hist.* p 26, and Collier's *Br Em.* pp 14,17).

In this way, for centuries before the Norman Conquest, there was all disorder in England, and chaos had reigned supreme in the country, barring a ray of light here and there, at intervals. In these circumstances, the people had hardly time, or were scarcely able to think of civil rights, a fact admitted even by English writers of authority (p 469 ; ante pp 403,404). Nay, even after the Norman Conquest, although it had repressed intestine wars and the disorders of a divided country, still, the advent of the Norman rule seemed "fatal to the liberties and ancient customs of Saxon-England, as these were almost swept away (p 407). Moreover, the Commons also had not, even so far late in the day as A. D. 1295, learnt to value the franchise that was at times extended to them (*En. Br.* xviii. 304).

To this again may also be added the fact that the English Kings were still absolute rulers, and there was a total relapse of Parliamentary influence, as its life was apparently extinct with the close of the Wars of the Roses in A. D. 1485 (ante p 413). While, the accession of the Tudors may be said to be the period of absolute royal power ; as, King Henry VIII had not only crushed out the old English freedom, but the Parliament was at his feet to do his bidding. In fact, the power of the crown never stood higher than it did in his reign and that of Elizabeth (pp 413,414).

In short, for hundreds of years, the kings of England had ruled just as they pleased, and kept most of the power in their own hands (ante p 415). To this absolute rule of English monarchs, may also be added the fact that, " From the earliest Saxon-times, the evil (of *Villanage* or Slavery) had prevailed in England. The Norman Conquest had changed the masters without freeing the slaves. But, about the reign of Henry II, the good work began. During three centuries, it went on slowly, yet surely.....When it was a disgrace to be called an Englishman, Nicholas Breakspear, an Englishman, was made a Pope..... Among the clergy, there were soon found many who had sympathy for the enslaved race ; and

it became a custom, when [a] slaveholder was dying, to persuade him, by all the authority of the Church, to set free his slaves. The civil war (A. D. 1455-1485), by breaking the power of the ruling race, aided this great movement, and the opening of the Tudor period saw villenage abolished in England for ever." (*Vide* Dr. Collier's History of the British Empire. Edition 1882. p 141). Thus, absolutism, Villenage or Slavery in England, and want of knowledge which was pent up long within the monasteries only, were not at all favourable to free thinking, much less to higher ideas like the Jury-system. A Western writer, therefore, has declared it to be idle to debate about the invention or introduction of trial by Jury (see *infra* p 469).

In fact, it was only about the close of the fifteenth century, or say the accession of Henry VII (A. D. 1485), that knowledge had begun to be diffused in printed works, books, or pamphlets, among the people and the homes of the masses, who therefore had only then an opportunity to read, consider, and think for themselves. Or, in the words of Dr. William Francis Collier, " True English history begins with the reign of Henry VII....., and a new and better order of things arose.... We have seen the nobles of England little better than robbers, the peasantry of England little better than slaves. We shall now see...the slaves set free, and a middle class

of farmers and merchants arise." (*vide* Collier's History of the British Empire. Ed. 1882. p 145). While, Draper says, "At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the island (of Britain) was far more backward, intellectually and politically, than is commonly supposed." (*Intellectual Development of Europe*. 5th Edition).

Having had, therefore, due regard to all these circumstances, it was probably during the subsequent period that the system of Jury was introduced into England; although, as observed in *The Historians' History of the World*, "It is idle to debate about the invention or introduction of trial by Jury." (*vide* Vol. xviii. p 209. Edition 1907). We, however, have been inclined to think, for reasons which we shall presently state (*infra pp 472 et seque*), that India has been the *original source* of the Institution of the Jury-system, which has enjoyed popularity from ancient times; and the great communication between the East and the West, that existed from very early period of history, was instrumental in the diffusion of knowledge of the system.

We have already seen the great antiquity of the Jury-system of India, and even noticed its development from very ancient times, down to the first half of the nineteenth century (*ante p 454*). Obviously, it was owing to this reason that John D. Mayne observed that,

"Hindu Law has the oldest pedigree of any known system of Jurisprudence, and even now, it shows no signs of decrepitude," (Hindu Law and Usage. First Edition. 1876. Preface. p ix). In like manner, Sir Henry Maine has indicated "the sort of instruction which India may be expected to yield to the student of historical jurisprudence" (p 15), and remarked later on that, "the social constitution of India is of the extreme ancient, that of England of the extreme modern type." (p 56. *Vide Village Communities in the East and West*. Edition 1890). We have also noticed that Forsyth's Trial by Jury, Stubb's Constitutional History, Freeman's Norman Conquest, &c, have all of them discussed various points in this connection, but have altogether ignored our Hindu Law and Usage that has the oldest pedigree of any known system of jurisprudence, nay even our most important Village Communities and their functions, our Self-Government and the Jury-System, our Arbitration methods and the juridical achievements of the Hindu mind, as seen in our Smriti works. As such, therefore, the views propounded in the aforesaid English works may be considered to be absolutely one sided, in the light of facts perceived in the Code of Manu and its forerunners of great antiquity, which obviously seem to have been altogether disregarded (*vide ante pp 446-456*).

Apart from this, there is again another thing which deserves special attention. The Reader perhaps remembers that some scholars of the West, with great knowledge of the East, have advanced the argument in right earnest that, "the Jury-System came from Asia through the Crusades"; and as in ancient times, India was the only seat of great learning and juridical knowledge, it seems more than probable that she was the *original source* of the Jury-system, and that other nations had received it from her; especially, as the Crusades or the Wars of the Cross, which, Dr. Collier says in his "History of the British Empire" (Ed. 1882, p 78), had afresh, "opened the East to commerce," had facilitated, not to say accelerated communication, as also interchange of ideas, and thus enabled the West to obtain from the East what it had not before (*vide supra pp 197-199*).

I may here state in passing that, the Crusades or the *Wars of the Cross* had begun in 1096 and were over in 1192. While our Jury-system was in working order and in full swing in India, not only during this period but prior to it, and even from before the Christian Era down to the first half of the nineteenth century (*ante pp 446-454*), when it was put an end to, by the British Government (*ante pp 19, 20, 264, Foot-note*).

But, more than this and to crown the whole, I would here adduce the most reliable as also direct and undisputed evidence in respect of the great antiquity of our Jury-System, and even this of the period, where we stand on solid as well as on historical ground, and in which the name of one figures prominently, as he has been known to be a master-statesman and a reputed writer on politics, a foresighted politician of exceptional abilities and of extraordinary powers of organization, a king-maker and builder of a great Empire. This famous personage was no other than the great Kautilya, also named Vishnugupta, and familiar to us all by the patronymic Chânakya. He was a Brâhman minister of Emperor Chandragupta, and his renowned work is *Arthashâstra*, which, as Dr. Fleet says, claims to date from B. C. 321-296. (*vide ante pp 242-253*).

In this work, there are distinct indications of the prevalence of the Jury system, which seems to have been in full swing in the Empire of Chandrgupta, during his regime and even before, as Chânakya, the author of the treatise makes constant references to the contemporary authors on politics and to his past predecessors. Says Chânakya : " In the towns of ten, four hundred, and eight hundred villages, as also at places where districts meet, the judicial As-

sembly or Court shall consist of six persons, of whom three should be officers of Government, and three other learned persons (धर्मस्था¹: i. e. those who are acquainted with the sacred law), for carrying on the administration of justice. (Vide *Arthashāstra*. Book iii. Chapter 1).

In addition to these Courts, each village had also its local Court, composed of the Headman of the village and its elders (ग्रामवृद्धाः). These decided minor criminal cases such as those of petty thefts, &c., as well as civil suits of a trivial nature like boundary disputes; and their powers also were limited, as they only inflicted small fines and restored or transferred possession of property. After hearing the parties concerned, the decision in each case was given in accordance with the opinion of the majority of honest and respectable persons composing the court (यतो बहवः शुचयोऽनुमता वा ततो निश्चयेयुः।). Vide *Arthashāstra*. Book iii. Chapter 9.

This Jury-System or administration of justice by Panchas continued down to the nineteenth century A. D., as we see even then, local committees or Panchâyats exercising ex-

1 The word *Dharmasthas* deserves notice. These were Jurors who served as Judges in company with Government officers, for deciding cases. In ancient Greece, Judges were called *Themists*, and this word seems to be a corruption of *Dharmasthas*.

tensive administrative and judicial powers under royal sanction (*vide ante pp 167,168,444,452, et seque*). While, in Ceylon, justice was administered by means of Communal Courts composed of Headmen and responsible householders of villages, subject to the authority of the King in Council. The Slab-inscription, which contains other particulars runs thus:—"...They (the headmen and the householders) shall sit in session, and enquire of the inhabitants of the Dasagam (in regard to these crimes). The proceedings of the enquiry having been so recorded that the same may be produced (thereafter), they shall have the murderer punished with death. Out of the property taken by the thieves by violence, they shall have such things, as have been identified, restored to their respective owners, and have (the thieves) hanged...." (*Vide ante pp 451,452, where other particulars have been given*).

The subsequent development of our Jury-System having already been noticed, I need not recapitulate the details here (*Vide ante pp 453-459*). See also *pp 472-476*.

Here, perhaps, one would argue that, by the famous Calpurnian Law of Rome (149 B. C.), all Provincial Magistrates accused of corrupt dealings in their government used to be tried before a Praetor (as presiding judge) and a

jury of Senators, or of Equites who were substituted for the former. But, of this Roman jury, the less said the better, as all the principles of the Jury-System were here totally lost sight of, and the maxims of justice altogether ignored. For, to quote the Historians, "the complainants and the jury belonged to the same body; and the Knights or Equites proved that they were not more fit than the Senators, to be judges in their own case,...and of their own Order." (*Vide* Dr. Liddell and Mr. Benecke's History of Rome. Edition 1901. pp 497, 498, 535,582).

Obviously, the new juries of knights who were farmers of the revenues of Roman provinces that were put up to auction, had their selfish reasons and interested motives for acquitting corrupt governors and magistrates chosen from amongst the Senators, who could not now be jurors, having been deprived of judicial powers, under the Law of Gracchus. These wielded enormous power in the conquered Provinces, and without their countenance, they (the Knights-farmers) could not exact money with their usual rapacity, beyond what was strictly legal. I, therefore, leave it to the Reader to form his own opinion of the Roman jury, in the light of facts placed before him.

Thus, the evidence produced will, we understand, sufficiently prove the great antiquity and

long continuity of our Hindu Jury-System, which, by the bye, is of indigenous growth in India, and not at all exotic or foreign to the soil, as supposed by some (ante p 442), and as has already been shown (p 443 *et seque*). And yet, this our Jury-system was but one of the several achievements of the Hindu juridical mind; to which might, with advantage, be added the various kinds of law-courts, established for the due administration of justice throughout the Hindu Empire; such as the King's Court which was the highest Court of Appeal, the various Original and Appellate Courts in important centres or larger towns, the local Courts of the village, the Arbitration Courts, and the Itinerant Courts, before described (supra pp 451-456), the like¹ of

1 (a) Says John D. Maine: "Hindu Law has the oldest pedigree of any known system of jurisprudence." *Vide supra* p 199.

(b) Observes Julius Jolly thus: "the Nārada Smṛiti must be considered as an independent, and therefore specially valuable exposition of the whole system of civil and criminal exposition, as taught in the law-schools of the period." p xiv.

(c) And again Julius Jolly declares in respect of the Law Book of Brihaspati as follows:—"The fragments of Brihaspati are among the most precious relics of the early legal literature of India. Apart from their intrinsic value and interest as containing a very full exposition of the whole range of the Hindu law, their close connexion with the Code of Manu gives them a special claim to consideration, and renders them a valuable link in the chain of

which is not seen either in the East or in the West, except very late in the day ; although, there are those, who having been predisposed towards, and as such great admirers of, Egypt or Babylon, Greece or Rome, would have us believe without tangible proofs, that the one or the other of the said regions was the birth-place of all civilization on Earth, and that every thing emanated from it [*vide supra pp 297, 275 (e)*]. I would, therefore, for the conviction of the Reader, invite his attention to the one sided views of some writers, whose vision having been impaired by deep prejudice and preconceived notions, have distorted facts and even suppressed them to suit their ends, a practice altogether condemned in unmeasured terms by historians like Gibbon and Ockley. (*Vide supra pp 32-34*).

I would now only make reference to one more thing which has remained unexplained ; *viz.*, the reason why, while comparing the polity of the East with that of the West, I had, leaving

evidence by which the date of the most authoritative Code of ancient India has been approximately determined." p 271.

Jolly also eulogises and gives prominence to "the enlightened views of Brihaspati on the subject of women's rights, and the advanced character of his teaching generally." p 275. (*Vide Sacred Books of the East. Vol. xxxiii. Edition 1889. pp xiv, 271, 275*).

(d) *Vide* also the Laws of Manu. Sacred Books of the East. Vol. xxv,

all the other countries of the East, taken up only India on the one hand, and on the other, Israel, Greece, Rome, and England, leaving all the other countries of the West. Obviously, I had taken up India, because (1) she has had, as admitted by all, an immense past and hoary antiquity (ante *pp* 101-104), (2) is the *original source* of all knowledge, as admitted even by Western scholars (*pp* 40, 88, 89, 90), (3) is admittedly *the earliest civilizer* of the world (*pp* 36, 37, 87, 100, 297, 298), (4) has claimed *Self-Government*, Representative Institutions, Constitutional Monarchy, as also the *will-power* of the nation from earliest times (*pp* 22, 47, 99, 273), (5) has exhibited various forms of Governments as shown before (*pp* 377 @ 384), (6) has had her (a) Religious Congress, (b) her Village Communities or Village Republics, and (c) her National Assemblies from olden times (*p* 47), (7) had even the *three Estates of the Realm* (*p* 377), (8) had the Jury-System all her own (*pp* 446 *et seque*), and (9) has, therefore, been rightly supposed to be the very type of the East.

While as regards the Governments of the countries of the Israelites, Greece, Rome, and England, I have to say that I had taken up these only, because a Western writer and an acknowledged authority had, among the Governments of the West, made special mention only of the

Government of Lycurgus, as also of Solon, Moses, Numa, and Alfred, declaring that, "The government of Sparta, was the invention of Lycurgus. Solon, Moses, Numa, and Alfred, in like manner, shaped the government of their respective nations." (*Vide* Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. xi. p 10. Ninth Edition).

Moreover, larger space had to be allotted to the polity of England, firstly because, the afore-said authority having observed that, "the Parliamentary Government, developed by England out of feudal materials, has been deliberately accepted as the type of constitutional Government all over the world" (ante p 420), it was deemed desirable to scrutinize the assertion from all stand-points, in view of seeing the real state of things in England ; and secondly, to enable the Reader to see that the various disabilities¹

¹ These disabilities may be summed up in brief as under:—

- (a) Dissensions and hatred rife among the Indians, and different communities warring in the bosom of the country, on account of various creeds, nationalities, and religions.
- (b) Ignorance of the masses, and want of Education in India.
- (c) Habits of Self-Government unknown to Indians.
- (d) Indians always accustomed to rely entirely on Government.
- (e) The value of the franchise not appreciated in India.
- (f) Representation unknown to the people.
- (g) Absence, in short, of all the qualifications required for Self-Government, though Lord Salisbury has admitted our capacity for Self-Government (*infra* p. 484).

heaped upon us, for the express purpose, as will be presently shown, of bringing with a vengeance obstacles, on account of race-prejudice, in the way of our getting Self-Government, had, all of them and even more than these, widely existed in England and its colonies ; and yet, they were given the boon of *Self-Government*, even when responsible statesmen at the helm were perfectly cognizant of the fact of the *utter unfitness* of their race and brethren *for self-government*, as appears clear from their views frankly expressed by them, and already placed before the Reader in full, for his information (*Vide supra pp 292 @ 324 ; 466, 415-417*).

We have, in short, as far as we could, refuted all the charges laid at our door, in respect of our unfitness for self-government, which obviously appears to be more created and imaginary than real. Because, interests of Self often assert themselves everywhere, and asseverations about want of capacity of the Indians seem, as Dr. Dadabhoi Nowroji, our *Grand old man*, has put it, but "another favourite argument of some Anglo-Indians." He has, moreover, observed later on, that, "it is the old trick of the tyrant not to give you the opportunity of fair trial, and to condemn you off hand, as incapable " *p. 391*.

In fact, "England," he said, "though she does every thing she can for other countries,

fights shy of, and makes some excuse or other to avoid, giving to the people of India their fair share in the legislation of their country ;" adding further that, "after having a glorious history of heroic struggles for constitutional government, England is now rearing up a body of Englishmen in India, trained up and accustomed to despotism, with all the feelings of impatience, pride, and high-handedness of the despot, becoming gradually ingrained in them, and with the additional training of the dissimulation of constitutionalism...The English in India, instead of raising India, are hitherto themselves descending and degenerating to the lower level of Asiatic despotism....It is extraordinary how nature may revenge itself for the present unnatural course of England in India, if England, not yet much tainted by this demoralisation, does not, in good time, check this new leaven that is gradually fermenting among her people." (*Vide* Dr. Dādābhāi Nowroji's *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India*. Edition 1901. pp 214, 215).

With all this, however, we always feel grateful for all the good that has been done to us by Britain, although, much more good might have been done and innumerable benefits secured by India, with even greater advantage to the British Isles and the Rulers themselves, if these had shown more sympathy for Indians, and not con-

sidered them as foreigners. It is often asserted that India has been more prosperous now, than before she came under British rule. This argument, however, is certainly fallacious. For, the real facts are altogether different from what they seem to the eye. Since, we see even eminent British statesmen and Anglo-Indians, who had carried on the administration of India, asserting what they had experienced. Lord Cromer describes the "extreme poverty" of India; while, Lord Lawrence observes: "India is, on the whole, a very poor country; the mass of the population enjoy only scanty subsistence." (1864). Lord Mayo, in his speech in the Legislative Council said: "I admit the comparative poverty of this country (India), as compared with other countries,...and I am convinced of the impolicy and injustice of imposing burdens upon this people, which may be called either crushing or oppressive" (3rd March 1871).

Mr. W. G. Pedder said in 1873,... "If an almost universal consensus of opinion may be relied on," the people of India "are rapidly going from bad to worse under our rule," and this "is a most serious question, and one well deserving the attention of Government."

And Sir John Shore adds, "there is reason to conclude that the benefits are more than counterbalanced by evils inseparable from a

European government. (*Vide* Dr. Dadabhai Nowroji's *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India*. Ed. 1901. pp 50, 51, 39).

All these evils and consequent poverty have obviously been caused by oppression, extortion, and the permanent yet exhausting drain from India to England, as will be apparent from the statements of experts and British statesmen that had thorough knowledge of both the countries, and had carefully scrutinized all available facts and figures without bias, and doubtless with the justice and fairness, which the subject required. While discussing this all-engrossing theme of drain, Dr. Dadabhai Nowroji says : " The benefit to England by its connection with India must not be measured by the £ 500,000,000 only, during the last 38 years (from 1835 to 1872 both inclusive). Besides this, the industries of England receive large additional support for supplying all European stores which Government need, and all those articles which Europeans want in India." The drain referred to was much less than at present. I therefore give the figures in Mr. Montgomery Martin's own words. " It is impossible to avoid remarking two facts as peculiarly striking—first, the richness of the country (India) surveyed ; and second, the poverty of its inhabitants. The annual drain of £3,000,000 on British India has amounted in

30 years, at 12 per cent (the annual Indian rate) compound interest, to the enormous sum of £ 723,900,000 sterling. So constant and accumulating a drain, even in England, would soon impoverish her. How severe then must be its effects on India, where the wage of a labourer is from two pence to three pence a day" (*Poverty and Un-British Rule in India*. Ed. 1901. pp 35, 40).

The opinion, in this respect, of Mr. Frederic John Shore is also very important, and has been given before (ante pp 335, 336. Foot-note).

In these circumstances, it will be wise if the rulers, with due regard to our administrative capacities for ages (ante pp 284-291), should deem it necessary to make a beginning at once, by giving to the people of India their share in the administration of their country. As, even Lord Salisbury, (then Lord Cranborne and Secretary of State for India) had remarked on 22nd January 1867, that "*it would be a great evil if the result of our dominion was that the Natives of India who were capable of government should be absolutely and hopelessly excluded from such a career.*" * * I quite admit the temptations which a paramount power has to interpret that axiom rather for its own advantage than its own honour. *There is no doubt of the existence of*

that temptation, but that does not diminish the truth of the maxim." *Hansard*. Vol 185. p 839. (The Italics are mine. *The Author*).

The apparent effect of these temptations, seems conspicuous in the polity of England which the latter has pursued in India, and in the evils of the present system of the British Indian Government, which have remained in subterfuges and in subtle forms, as even the Committee of the Council of the Secretary of State for India have declared the British Government to "be exposed to the charge of keeping promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope". (*vide supra* p 302 Foot-note .

We have, however, been surprised to observe that even when these responsible persons at the helm of the State see things eye to eye, and under their nose, they hardly ever honestly¹ try to mend matters in a way that will afford permanent and perceptible relief. Truly has it been said by a poet :

"Those lofty souls have telescopic eyes,
That see the smallest speck of distant pain,
While at their feet a world of agonies,
Unseen, unheard, unheeded writhes in vain."

(Great Thoughts).

1 *Vide supra* p 302, Foot-notes (*h* and *i*); and p 308. Foot-notes (1 *a* and 2 *b*).

Now, let us see what Dr. Dadabhai Nowroji-our *Grand Old Man*-has to say in respect of this matter. He remarks, ...*"the Indians have been crying all along in the wilderness.*

That we feel the sharp, not to say unbearable pinch at every step, is admitted even by Anglo-Indians, who have been men on the spot, and who cannot be supposed to ever declare views which would affect, or are opposed to the interests of the Anglo-Indians themselves. For instance, we see an Anglo-Indian organ candidly recognising the fact that India "has also perhaps to undergo the often subtle disadvantages of foreign rule" (Vide *The Pioneer* of Allaha-

Let the saddle of the present evil System, be on the right horse. The Sovereign, the Parliament, and the people have done all that could be desired. The only misfortune is that they do not see to their noble wishes and orders being carried out, and leave their servants to "bleed" India of all that is most dear and necessary to the human existence and advancement—wealth, wisdom, and work—material and moral prosperity. Reverting to Lord Lytton's true confession, that the executive have "cheated" and "subterfuged," frustrated and dishonoured all Acts and resolutions of Parliament, and the most solemn Proclamations of the Sovereign, one would think that after such confessions, some amends will be made by a more honourable course. Far from it. This despatch of 2nd May 1878, will remain one of the darkest sections in this sad story, instead of any contrition or reparation for the past evil."

"What did the Government propose in this despatch? To destroy everything that is dearest to the Indian heart—his two great Charters of 1833 and 1858, the Act of a partial justice of 1870—to murder in cold blood the whole political existence of equality of Indians as British citizens which—at least by law, if not by deed or action of the authorities—they possessed, and make them the *Pariahs* of the high public service." (*Poverty and Un-British Rule in India*. Edition 1901. pp 435, 436).

bad, dated 21-9-95); and yet, nothing has been sincerely done to improve matters, as we have already seen, how all sorts of means have been purposely devised by Government to practically evade the fulfilment of what is intended to be given to India (*supra* p 302. Foot-note i).

The cause of this is not far to seek. For, there is prominently, before our eyes, the race-prejudice, and to this may be added the fact that the British rulers naturally consider themselves foreigners in India. They, therefore, care more for their race and for Britain, and as such, cannot be expected to have any real sympathy¹, much less paternal feeling for India and the Indians, as will be evident from the Indentured labour system and the various subterfuges ; although, there appears everything well on paper, and still more so on lips, or in words full of blandishments. When, however, the time comes for deeds or action, and for carrying out the promises already made, political hypocrisy makes its appearance, and subtle devices are contrived to make public Acts and great Proclamations mere shams, delusions, and dead letters, as will appear from the following :—On 1st of January 1877, on the assumption by Queen Victoria

1 Baber, the first sovereign of the Mogul dynasty regarded "Hindustan with the same dislike that Europeans still feel." (*Vide* Dr. Dadabhai Nowroji's *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India*. Edition 1901. p 587).

of the title of Empress of India, at the Delhi Assemblage, Lord Lytton on behalf of her Majesty said :

...“ You, the Natives of India, whatever your race and whatever your creed, have a recognised claim to share *largely* with your English fellow subjects, according to your capacity for the task, in the administry of the country you inhabit. *This claim is founded* on the highest justice. It has been repeatedly affirmed by British and Indian statesmen, and by the legislation of the Imperial Parliament. It is recognised by the Government of India, as binding on its honour and consistent with all the aims of its policy.” But, says Dr. Dadabhai Nowroji, notwithstanding this solemn declaration, all such ‘highest justice,’ and all this ‘binding on honour,’ ended in the extraordinary despatch of 2nd May, 1878 ! It is the most dismal page in the whole melancholy affair about the Covenanted Service.”

“ The wonder is that on the one hand Lord Lytton exposes the subterfuges and dishonour of the Executive; and himself and his colleagues sign such a despatch of 2nd May 1878,” some sixteen months after the claims of the Indians were duly recognised by Lord Lytton himself along with their English fellow subjects. (Vide *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India*. Edition 1901. pp 437, 438).

Without giving further details, it would, I think, suffice to state what Dr. Dadabhai Nowroji has observed in brief. Says he : 'Whatever may be the merits and demerits of "The State and Government of India under its Native Rulers," one thing is certain, that the greatest evil of the present un-British system of British rule in India did not exist under the Native rulers—viz, the unceasing and ever increasing bleeding and drain of India by "the evils inseparable from the system of a remote foreign dominion" (Sir John Shore, 1787), and by inflicting upon India every burden of expenditure incurred even for the interests of Britain. This evil is further aggravated by what Lord Salisbury calls "political hypocrisy," or by what Lord Lytton calls "deliberate and transparent subterfuges," producing what Lord Salisbury calls "terrible misery," or what Lord Cromer calls "extreme poverty," or what Lord Lawrence described as "that the mass of the people live on scanty subsistence."

Poverty and Un-British Rule in India. Edition 1901. p 579).

"Injustice," said Lord Salisbury "shall bring down the mightiest to ruin."

'There is no justification of British rule in India, if it is to be an un-British despotism, with all the crushing additional evils of a foreign despotism ; for, as Macaulay says, "the heaviest of

all yokes is the yoke of a stranger." It has been repeatedly said by eminent Englishmen that—using Lord Mayo's words—"The welfare of the people of India is the primary object. If we are not here for their good, *we ought not to be here at all.*"

'The despotism of former rulers is no justification for the bleeding despotism of the British rulers.' (*Poverty and Un-British Rule in India*. Edition 1901. pp 579, 580).

Even so early as 1764, the Court of Directors wrote as follows, in respect of the territories under the Government of Bengal: "Your deliberations on the inland trade have laid open to us a scene of most cruel oppression; the poor of the country, who used always to deal in salt, betel-nut, and tobacco, are now deprived of their daily bread by the trade of the Europeans."

Again in 1766, the Court of Directors observed thus: "We must add that we think the vast fortunes acquired in the inland trade have been obtained by a scene of the most tyrannic and oppressive conduct that ever was known in any age or country."

And Lord Macaulay had summed up:—"A war of Bengalees against Englishmen was like a war of sheep against wolves, of men against demons. The business of a servant of the Company was simply to wring out of the

Natives a hundred or two hundred thousand pounds as speedily as possible." (*Poverty and Un-British Rule in India* pp 275,276).

Dr. Dadabhai Nowroji had once remarked at Kennington, during the course of the debate in respect of the Indian Famine and its Remedies, that "when the British people first obtained territorial power in India, bad seeds were unfortunately sown. The Company went there solely for the sake of profit, greed was at the bottom of every thing they did, and the result was that corruption, oppression, and rapacity became rampant"...Then replying on the whole debate, he said, "No speaker had attempted to dispute his assertion that Indian resources had been exhausted by British policy which was thus responsible for the famines. It had been suggested that India should look more to manufacturing industries, and be less dependent upon agriculture. But, it seemed to be forgotten that the Indian industries had been destroyed by the British policy. India was originally noted for her industries. Venice and other ancient cities acquired great wealth through their trade with India, but Great Britain had deprived them of their life blood, and they would no longer carry on their industries, because they had no means wherewith to maintain them...He thought he had been able to show that England's policy had had might and not right as

its foundation. There was no ground for charging India with ingratitude and disloyalty, if she resented the violation of the solemn pledges to treat her people justly'... (Poverty of India pp 654-659).

It would not be out of place here to state that those, who fall victims to the temptations which a paramount power ever has, cause unnecessary irritation, create new difficulties, and make things rough and unpleasant everywhere. Our wise Sires, therefore, not only always resisted these galling temptations with great care and caution but also tried to make things smooth by all means in their power, nay even by actual deeds, without giving vent to empty words. The natural consequence that flowed from this happy state of things, was that peace and plenty, happiness and contentment ever reigned supreme, in the Hindu Empire, and *Vive le roi* was the grateful expression on the lips of every one of the teeming millions of the soil (supra p 275. Foot-note 1 infra pp 493, 494).

Such was the policy pursued by our hoary ancestors during, and after the Vedic times, and such the desired effect of it. There was everywhere in the Vedic India and subsequently, profound peace and plenty, happiness and contentment, law and order, of which the fruits could be seen, even then, in the stirring activities and intellectual life

of the period (*supra pp 64-74*). All this was owing to the fact that our ancient indigenous Rulers were of the country and of the people. They, therefore, had natural sympathy for them and their country, since, they considered these as their children.¹ Moreover, the ingrained idea in them was that the sovereign Ruler or the King was ever *for the people and his subjects; not the latter for the former* (*supra pp 137-152*).

The Reader perhaps has been aware that in the *hoary* times of Bháratavarsha, the King was *elected* by our people. The fact, accordingly of the King having been *elected* meant that the people had a *voice* in the choice of their sovereign and had even the *will-power* of the nation. As such, therefore, the King had always to yield to public opinion or the will of the Nation at large. In these circumstances, although the King had apparently ample powers and was loved by his nation, he was always kept *within constitutional limits* and never allowed to wield his powers arbitrarily. Thus, ours was a *constitutional* and *Limit-*

1 In the Rāmāyana, we have the following typical description of the King or Ruler, and of his relations with his subjects :—(*Vide also infra p 496*).

“ Truth, justice, and nobility of rank
Are centred in the King ; he is mother,
Father, and benefactor of his subjects.”

राजा सत्यं च धर्मश्च राजा कुलवर्ता कुलं ।

राजा माता पिता चैव राजा हितकरो वृणासु ॥

(रामायणे अ० कां० २.९७.२४).

its foundation. There was no ground for charging India with ingratitude and disloyalty, if she resented the violation of the solemn pledges to treat her people justly'... (Poverty of India pp 654-659).

It would not be out of place here to state that those, who fall victims to the temptations which a paramount power ever has, cause unnecessary irritation, create new difficulties, and make things rough and unpleasant everywhere. Our wise Sires, therefore, not only always resisted these galling temptations with great care and caution, but also tried to make things smooth by all means in their power, nay even by actual deeds, without giving vent to empty words. The natural consequence that flowed from this happy state of things, was that peace and plenty, happiness and contentment ever reigned supreme, in the Hindu Empire, and *Vive le roi* was the grateful expression on the lips of every one of the teeming millions of the soil (supra p 275. Foot-note 1 ; infra pp 493, 494).

Such was the policy pursued by our hoary ancestors during, and after the Vedic times, and such the desired effect of it. There was everywhere in the Vedic India and subsequently, profound peace and plenty, happiness and contentment, law and order, of which the fruits could be seen, even then, in the stirring activities and intellectual life

of the period (*supra pp 64-74*). All this was owing to the fact that our ancient indigenous Rulers were of the country and of the people. They, therefore, had natural sympathy for them and their country, since, they considered these as their children.¹ Moreover, the ingrained idea in them was that the sovereign Ruler or the King was ever *for the people and his subjects; not the latter for the former* (*supra pp 137-152*).

The Reader perhaps has been aware that in the hoary times of Bháratavarsha, the King was *elected* by our people. The fact, accordingly of the King having been *elected* meant that the people had a *voice* in the choice of their sovereign and had even the *will-power* of the nation. As such, therefore, the King had always to yield to public opinion or the will of the Nation at large. In these circumstances, although the King had apparently ample powers and was loved by his nation, he was always kept *within constitutional limits* and never allowed to wield his powers arbitrarily. Thus, ours was a *constitutional* and *Limi-*

1 In the Rāmāyana, we have the following typical description of the King or Ruler, and of his relations with his subjects :—(*Vide also infra p 496*).

“Truth, justice, and nobility of rank
Are centred in the King; he is mother,
Father, and benefactor of his subjects.”

राजा सत्यं च धर्मश्च राजा कुलवर्ता कुलं ।

राजा माता पिता चैव राजा हितकरो वृणाद् ॥

(रामायणे अ० का० २.५७.२४).

ted Monarchy, even in the Vedic period (supra pp 272, 273); and as the people always thought *that one only* to be a good king, who had ever at his heart the welfare of his subjects, he also in turn never failed to do his best in doing them good and augmenting their prosperity. In this way, mutual love and good understanding ever prevailed, and the interests of both having been identical, profound peace and contentment reigned supreme in our Vedic Empire, along with the happy conception of our ancestors, that *due respect* was to be paid to authority, that *union was strength*, that the administration must be *just, wise, and sympathetic*, and that no *wicked person* should have any *authority* over them (supra pp 114 et seque).

This was the desired effect of the Hindu policy, and during the Vedic period as also subsequently for a long time, we had the good fortune to enjoy the blessings of our halcyon days, almost continuously, barring fanatic rule and mal-administration at times. Our extensive Sanskrit Literature amply testifies the truth of the statement, while foreign and Greek evidence abundantly proves the fact. Says Elphinstone: "All the descriptions of the parts of India visited by the Greeks, give the idea of a country teeming with population, and enjoying the highest degree of prosperity." Arrian mentions with

admiration that all the Indians were free. Justice was administered by the King or judges, with the aid of Jurors ; and Elphinstone adds, " their (Hindus') institutions were less rude, their conduct to their enemies more humane, their general learning much more considerable, and in the knowledge of the being and nature of God, they (the Hindus) were already in possession of a light which was but faintly perceived, even by the loftiest intellects in the best days of Athens." (History of India. Vol. i).

To be brief, it would, I think, be no exaggeration to state, as the fact has been corroborated by even foreign evidence, that " when under the native Rajas (or Kings), India seems to have excelled in wealth, magnificence, and literature." (Vide F. De. W. Ward's *India and the Hindus*. Edition 1853. p 72).

Lastly, I would cite the evidence of that eminent statesman Sir John Malcolm, the same being of considerable importance, as it gives causes and effects of the prosperity reigning supreme in the provinces of India, *administered by indigenous rulers and the sons of the soil*. Says he, " I must unhesitatingly state that the provinces belonging to the family of Patvardhans and some other chiefs on the banks of the Krishna, present a greater agricultural and commercial prosperity than almost any I know in India. I refer this

to their system of administration, which, though there may be at periods exactions, is, on the whole, mild and parental ; to the knowledge and almost devotion of the Hindoos to all agricultural pursuits ; to their better understanding, or, at least, better practice than us in many parts of the administration, practically in raising towns and villages to prosperity from the encouragement given to moneyed men, and to the introduction of capital ; and above all to Jaghirdars residing on their estates, and these provinces being administered by men of rank, who live and die on the soil, and are usually succeeded in office by their sons or near relations. If these men exact money at times in an arbitrary manner, all their expenditure, as well as all they receive, is limited to their own provinces ; but, above all causes which promote prosperity, is the invariable support given to the village and other Native institutions, and to the employment, far beyond what our system admits, of all classes of the population."

Chapter XIV.

OUR POLITY AND ITS LASTING INFLUENCE ON HINDU WOMEN.

Sound polity and fundamentally valid principles, adopted for the good governance of Society, have an unfailing effect on the moral strength of a nation, which in turn has immense influence on men and women of the country.

The wise politicians and well versed Law-givers of Bhâratavarsha appear to have been much in advance of their times. They had, therefore, with a foresight not shown anywhere else in the world, directed, even in the earliest¹ period of the history of Mankind, their sole attention and best energies in inaugurating polity and framing rules of conduct, the essential precepts of which were *self-culture* and *self-restraint*. These were intended for the formation of virtues and good character of our nation, for their moral advancement and proper development of their physique, for pro-

1. Says Thornton :—"The Hindus are indisputably entitled to rank among the most ancient of existing nations, as well as among those most early and most rapidly civilized."

gress in intellectual pursuits and martial attainments. The special feature of the rules, however, was that due regard was paid even to female culture, and especially to matters which vitally concerned or affected women as matrons and mothers of children. Since, it was the mothers, the framers of the rules of conduct rightly thought, that nourished and reared up their children, and were chiefly responsible for, or instrumental in, preparing their mind for all actions, for glorious achievements or valorous deeds. Obviously, these rules, on account of their elevating nature, had evolved a type of Indian mankind, quite distinct from the surrounding population; and evidently, this type was the product of our self-centered refinement and hereditary culture, our love of knowledge and discipline, our temperance and great domestic virtues.

Here, therefore, I think it desirable to bring to the notice of the Reader the most important fact that, apart from the above rules of conduct, our Law-giver Manu¹ has laid great stress on

-
1. (a) यादृग्युणेन भर्त्रा स्त्री संयुज्येत यथाविधि ।
तादृग्युणा सा भवति ससुद्वेणेव निम्नगा ॥ २१ ॥
 - (b) अक्षमाला वसिष्ठेन संयुक्ताऽधमयोनिजा ।
झारंगी मंदपालेन जगामाम्यर्हणीयताम् ॥ २३ ॥
 - (c) एताश्चान्याश्च लोकेस्मिन्नपकृष्टप्रसूतयः ।
उत्कर्षं योषितः प्राप्ताः स्त्रैः स्वेर्भर्तृगुणैः शुभैः ॥ २४ ॥

(Code of Manu. IX. 22, 23, 24)

the nature and the superior quality of instructions¹ imparted by husbands to their wives, as on these principally depended the results good or bad, according to the elevating nature of these instructions, or otherwise. For instance, if the husbands' instructions constantly inculcate sound principles as also virtues, and are ennobling in their character, they are decidedly productive of good results. Since, the wives become the typical mothers of their children, and even the ornaments of their nation.

These facts, though very prominent and extremely important in themselves, have been lost sight of, nay totally ignored on account of prodigious ignorance and deep prejudice, and have consequently been altogether misunderstood and even misrepresented by many Orientals and Occidentals. In the circumstances, it seems desirable to endeavour to remove these erroneous notions, correct them in the light of available facts, and place before the Reader the requisite evidence on the subject.

1 (a) The union of husband and wife makes the latter partake of the qualities of the former, like the river joining the sea. (22).

(b) Akshamālā and Shārangi, though low-born, became the object of praise, on account of their respective husbands. Vasishtha and Mandapālā. (23).

(c) These and other low-born wives enjoyed an exalted position in life, owing to the excellent qualities of their husbands. (24).

Our ancient Fore-fathers were able to perceive, even during those remote times, that there was magnetic power in the woman, along with her many virtues and precious qualities, which having been latent, she was destined to exercise unbounded influence over man, for good or for bad, owing to peculiar characteristics of her nature. They, moreover, were justified in thinking that, this very power, if rightly directed into proper channels, and suitable use made thereof with tact and discretion, she was sure to wisely wield, and achieve admirable results in the nation's cause.

Obviously, under proper care and guidance, the expected results were vividly perceived, and brighter hopes were naturally entertained in regard to the future prospects, the career, and the claims on humanity of women, who were supposed by our wise Ancestors, and rightly too, to be *the very head and front* in matters that appertained to the proper nourishment of their children, the development of their physique, or the spontaneous growth of their intellect, nay even to things that concerned the full scope to their mental capacity, or to suitable opportunities for the evolution of manly qualities in the case of their sons, and lovely womanly delicacy or grace in the case of their daughters.

In this way, the qualities of women having been duly recognised, acknowledged, and even

warmly appreciated by our wise ancestors, these had a natural regard for them ; and as such, our women were greatly honoured even in the remotest past. For instance, the Rig-Veda says :—"A woman¹ is more firm and better than the man who is godless and is not charitable. She discerns² the distressed, the needy, and the thirsty ; and is even Godly herself."

In fact, the Hindu woman has more fervour, more kindly feeling, more sympathetic heart, and even more devotion to duty. As such, therefore, it is in the very nature of things that she has had the dominating influence in all our domestic, social, religious, and even political affairs, as will be seen from the sequel ; especially, as during our halcyon days, she had had an equal share in the education of the day, which having been liberal and of a varied character, gave her courage and sagacity, firmness and perseverance, legitimate freedom and strength of character. Nay, it even endowed her with advanced ideas in religion and philosophy, politics and sociology, science and poesy.

Evidently, it was owing to our Vedic polity, that we see our women what they have

1. उत त्वा स्त्री शशीयसी धुतो भवति वस्यसी अदेवत्रादराः सः ॥६॥

2. वि या जानाति जहुरिं वि तुष्यन्तं वि कामिनं । देवत्रा कृणुते
मनः ॥ ७ ॥

(Rig-Veda. V. 61. 6, 7).

been for ages. It was owing to the wisdom of our ancient Sires, that we see the stirring intellectual pursuits of Hindu women of the Vedic period, which Professor Weber described as follows :—"The free position held by women at this time is remarkable. We find songs of the *most exquisite kind* attributed to poetesses and queens, among whom the daughter of Atri appears in the foremost rank." "Marriage...is held *sacred*. Husband and wife are both *rulers* of the house (*dampati*), and approach the gods in united prayer." While in respect of the part taken by women in philosophical discussions with men, the Professor said, "We must, at any rate, assume among the Bráhmans of this period, a very stirring intellectual life, *in which even the women took an active part*, and which accounts still further for the *superiority maintained and exercised by the Brahmins over the rest of the people*.....Bráhmans who with lively emulation carry on their enquiries into the highest questions the human mind can propound ; women who with enthusiastic ardour plunge into the mysteries of speculation, *impressing and astonishing men by the depth and loftiness of their opinions*, and who solve the questions proposed to them on sacred subjects." (*Vide* Weber's History of Indian Literature. Second Edition. pp 21, 22, 38. The Italics in the quotation are mine. *The Author*).

So much then as regards the Hindu woman's dominating influence in the remote antiquity of the Vedic times. But, even before or during the Smṛiti period, and subsequently down to the present times, there appears to have been in India the same marvellous magnetic power of, and respect for, the woman; and Manu, our great Law-giver, has manifested great regard for her, by observing that women certainly deserve to be honoured as they rise to the rank of mothers, are *the ornaments and the light of home*, nay the very *receptacle of grace and glory* that dwell therein :—

प्रजनार्थं महाभागाः पूजार्हा गृहदीप्तयः ।

स्त्रियः स्त्रियश्च गेहेषु न विशेषोऽस्ति कश्चन ॥

(मनुस्मृतिः । ९-२६.)

Thus, both the *Shruti* and the *Smṛiti*, or our Revealed Scriptures and the Remembered Traditions appear to be unanimous in lavishing praises on the woman, and considering her as one that doubtless deserves to have a voice in all our affairs, whether religious and moral, political and educational, domestic and social, according to her capacity and deserts. And there are innumerable solid facts in proof of the matter, in the exuberant, varied, and very rich literature of Bhāratavarsha.

The direct fruit of the wise precepts of our ancient Vedic sages and the laws of Manu, is

the conjugal fidelity and affection, which stand *pre-eminently conspicuous* in our Hindu family. And I would here take the liberty to state that it is this *conjugal fidelity* and lasting affection that have been the cause of the dominant influence of Hindu women in all our affairs, and even on their progeny.

The primary source of the most coveted happiness, not to say exalted and unparalleled domestic comfort, of our Hindu family, is "*the mutual fidelity¹ till death*"; and this has been considered as the supreme law¹ or even the fundamental principle, according to our Hindu ideas. In the very nature of things, therefore, this law of duty and strict conjugal fidelity has been governing our Hindu families from the remotest past up to the present times, and affords to our ever eager view quite a charming galaxy of Hindu women devoted to their husbands and to duty. In fact, the history of no other nation whatever records more ennobling or more magnanimous instances of female sincerity and attachment. "Nor will the annals of any nation afford," says Colonel James Tod, "more sublime

1.. This has been laid down by Manu thus:—

अन्योन्यस्याऽप्यभीचारो । भवेदामरणान्तिकः ।

एष धर्मः समासेन ज्ञेयः स्त्रीपुंसयोः परः ॥ (मनुस्मृती ९. १०१).

"Let mutual fidelity continue till death. This, in brief, may be considered as the law of paramount importance, in respect of husband and wife."

or more numerous instances of female devotion.”
(*Vide* Tod's Rájasthân, Third Reprint. 1880.
Vol. I, p 526).

I cannot resist the temptation to quote here, for the conviction of the Reader, the charmingly beautiful, extremely pathetic, and the most ennobling sentiments, which spotless Sitá had given vent to, when her Lord Rámachandra was leaving home to pass his life as a recluse. Says she to him :—

“A woman's bliss is found, not in the smile
Of father, mother, friend, nor in herself,
Her husband is her only portion here,
Her heaven hereafter. If thou indeed
Depart this day into the forest drear,
I will precede, & smooth the thorny way.”

* * * *

“Thus could I sweetly pass a thousand
years;
But without thee e'en heaven would lose
its charms.”

* * * *

Pleased to embrace thy feet, I will reside
In the rough forest as my father's house.
Void of all other wish, supremely thine,
Permit me this request—I will not grieve,
I will not burden thee—refuse me not.
But should'st thou, Rághava, this prayer
deny,

Know, I resolve on death.

Such conjugal fidelity, such matchless love
of, and devotion to, husband, have made our

woman not only an object of great reverence, but her virtues themselves have been supposed to have a purifying effect¹; in as much as, even her husband, though himself righteous and possessed of all the desired good qualities, has, nevertheless, deemed himself purified by her.

As in the ancient times of Rāmāyana and Mahā-Bhārata, so also subsequently, we see every where, prominently brought to our view, Hindu woman's sincere devotion to duty, her conjugal fidelity, and her enjoyment of legitimate freedom. Among the innumerable instances of the kind, in the History of India, I would here mention the name of Rāni Ahalyā Bāi of Indore, a woman of conspicuous ability and force of character, of great moral virtues, courage, and sagacity. The *purdah* system, or seclusion like that of the Mahome-

1. I quote here below the beautiful stanza from the master-piece of the renowned poet Bhavabhūti.

यया पूतमन्यो निधिरपि पवित्रस्य महसः
 पतिस्ते पूर्वेषामपि खलु गुरुणां गुरुतमः ।
 त्रिलोकीमंगलयामवनितललोलेन शिरसा
 जगद्वन्द्यां देवीमुषसामिव वंदे भगवतीम् ॥

In this, Janaka has exhibited his great respect for Arundhati—the wife of Vasiṣṭha, by saying that, she was not only worthy of being worshipped by the world, but that even her great Lord and husband (Vasiṣṭha), who was the greatest of the ancient priests, though himself the store of all holy-merit, had nevertheless, thought himself purified (यया पूतमन्यः) by her. (Vide *Uttara Rāma Charitam*. Act IV).

dans, having not been enforced on us by our religion, we Hindus do not keep our women confined, nor compell them to wear veils. Accordingly, Rânee Ahalyâ Bâi used to sit in open Darbâr every day, for hours together, to hear petitions and transact State-business, in person. There would be no end to minute details of measures of her wise administration ; and the whole thing in a nutshell would be, as observed by Sir John Malcolm that, "she has' become, by general suffrage, the model of good government in Málwá.....In the most sober view that can be taken of her character, she certainly appears, within her limited sphere, to have been one of the purest and most exemplary rulers that ever existed ; and she affords a striking example of the practical benefit a mind may receive from performing worldly duties under a deep sense of responsibility to its Creator." (*Vide Memoir of Central India, including Malva. Third Edition. 1832. Vol. I. pp 185, 195*).

Are these—the most sublime examples of elevated sentiments and sincere devotion to duty, of Queen consort of Râma, of Rânee Ahalyâ Bâi, and of others of the kind,—an indication of Hindu woman's thralldom ? Do they, in any way, manifest her state as one of captivity ? The true answer is, as rightly observed by Colonel Tod, that the superficial observer, who applies his own

standard to the customs of all nations, - laments with an affected philanthropy the degraded condition of the Hindu female or her want of liberty, and calls her seclusion imprisonment. But, Tod having had sufficient personal experience in the matter says, "From the knowledge I do possess of the freedom, the respect, the happiness, which the Rajput women enjoy, I am by no means inclined to deplore their state as one of captivity"; and adds further that, "most erroneous ideas have been formed of the Hindu female, from the pictures drawn by those who never left the bank of the Gangese. They are represented as degraded beings, and that not one in many thousands can even read." But, "though immured¹ and invisible, their influence on society is not less certain than if they moved in the glare of open day." Thus, it is deep ignorance that has been the root-cause of such grievous

1. The Hindus naturally attribute this custom of seclusion to the paramount domination of the Mahomedans, who secluded their women, a rigid system enjoined by the Prophet Mahommed. Besides, "the harems of the most powerful of the Delhi conquerors were filled with ladies of Hindu families"; and "the conquerors were notorious for expressing.....their too energetic admiration of the charms of Hindu women". The Hindus, therefore, of the parts of India, subject to frequent Islam raids, to save their women from infamy, borrowed the Mahomedan custom of secluding their women. (*Vide* John J. Pool's *Women's Influence in the East*. Edition 1892. Sir Lepel Griffin's Introduction. pp vi. vii).

misunderstanding and gross misrepresentation. (*Vide* Tod's *Rājasthāna*. Vol. I, pp. 523, 524, 551. Third Reprint, 1880).

Miss Florence Nightingale also much deplores the enormous ignorance of the English people in respect of the women of India, and says, "We English women understand as little the lives and circumstances, the ideas and feelings of these hundred millions of women of India, as if they lived in another planet. They are not reached by us, and even by those of us who have lived in powerful positions in India. Yet, the women of India possess influence the most unbounded." (*Vide* Miss Florence Nightingale's Introduction to an English Edition of Behramji M. Malabari's *Biographical Sketch*).

In the circumstances, it will be seen that those who have not seen our domestic life, have no experience of the happy Hindu homes, happy Hindu wives and husbands, happy Hindu mothers and children ; who have no knowledge of the *exemplary conjugal fidelity* and domestic virtues predominant in our Hindu families ; and who have no real acquaintance with our vast literature that breathes at every page our women's magnetic power, their supreme influence, and the great freedom they have been enjoying, talk or write as pleases their fancy, without requisite enquiry, and without seeing things eye to eye.

Fortunately, however, there are persons of high rank as also others, whose opinion, on account of their varied knowledge and study of the subject, is essentially entitled to weight, and who having been desirous to see how facts really stand in view of doing justice to Hindu women, have given free vent to their thoughts, which, therefore, I shall place before the Reader for his information.

Lady Dufferin, in one of her observations regarding India says, "But, deeply as I feel for an Indian woman's sorrows, I cannot ignore her joys, and I certainly am able to have a more kindly sentiment towards the nation as a whole, because I have seen happy wives and happy mothers in India, and because I believe in happy Indian homes." (*Vide* Lady Dufferin's Article in the Nineteenth Century). In like manner, while addressing Hindu audience and speaking about Child-marriages amongst Hindus, Mrs. Pichey Phipson remarks : "And there is much in your (Hindu) family-life that excites my sincere admiration, much in the devout piety which appears to me to be a strong characteristic of the Hindu mind, which commands my respect."

Now, let us see what Dr. Max Muller says, in respect of the Hindu happy homes, notwithstanding the prevalence of child-marriage

amongst the Hindus. He observes, "We should remember that in India the child-like devotion of a young girl is concentrated from the first on one object only, never dissipated, never frustrated by any early disappointments. A husband though a mere boy is accepted by the young bride, as we have to accept father and mother, sister and brother. A husband is not chosen, he is given ; and to repudiate such a gift seems as unnatural to them as to repudiate father and mother, sister and brother, would seem to us. Natives, who speak at all of the mysteries of their heart, dwell with rapture on the days of their boyhood and boyish love as the most blissful of their whole lives." (Max Muller on Indian Child-wife. Vide *Contemporary Review*).

In connection with the aforesaid remarks of Max Muller, the Editor of the *Times of India* writes as follows:—"The child-wife, whose story he (Max Muller) briefly narrates, is the late Shrimati Soudâmini Rây wife of one of the prominent members of the Brâhma Samâja, Bâbu Kedâr Nâth Rây. Shrimati was married at the age of nine to a husband of twelve. But, though young, the couple loved each other ardently, and together they were prepared to brave the storms of life raised by their joining the Brâhma Samâja, and renouncing the ancient faith of their fathers.....Nor did their mutual

love abate. She twined round him like a creeper, but it was the creeper that gave strength to him, and upheld him in all his trials and all his aspirations. Every morning and evening, the happy wife prayed with her husband, and later she conducted the domestic services for her children and servants. Theirs was a quiet and uneventful life, full of silent joys and sorrows. Nature supplied them with all the objects of their admiration, and religion lifted their souls to the sublimest happiness.....They well knew the rapture that springs from feeling a divine presence in every thing, in the soft breezes of the evening, in the whisper of leaves, in the silver rays of the moon, and most of all, in the deep, silent glances of two loving eyes." (*Vide The Times of India*. Dated 12th September 1891).

This in brief is the picture of our Hindu life ; this the out-line of Hindu happiness and conjugal fidelity ; this the description of domestic joys and trials. Naturally, with due regard to all these facts, even foreigners and Europeans have had to admit the excellence of our family-life and the dominating influence of Hindu women in the religious, domestic, social, and political life of the country. Sir George Birdwood has, therefore, thus expressed himself in the matter: "The marriage laws of the Hindus have served to create *the highest type* of family life

known. For its simplicity, affection, reverence, and purity, it is absolutely inapproachable by any other nation." He has also further observed, while making the requisite remarks in respect of the Consent Bill that, "Above any other subject affecting the Hindus, this (marriage-law reform) is the one, they should be left to deal with themselves."

We believe that women exercise their influence even in the West. For, Mr. Pool observes thus in his work: "Woman's influence for good or for evil, is admittedly great in all Western lands" But, it seems from the opinion of Sir Lepel Griffin, frankly expressed, that there is yet much to be desired in the life of English women. Since, he says, "And it may be fairly asserted that the position of a married Mahomedan woman to-day is socially and legally more secure and protected against arbitrary violence, either to person or property, than that of an English woman, whose disabilities until the last few years were a reproach to our civilization. Even now, in matters such as divorce, the English woman occupies an ignominious position, which it should be the object of all legislators, possessed of chivalry and good sense, to remove as speedily as possible." (Vide Mr. Pool's *Woman's influence in the East*. Edition 1892. Introduction, p. vii).

We have already referred to the stirring intellectual life and freedom enjoyed by our women in the Vedic times (ante p 502), that is, thousands of years before the Christian Era. But, even so late in the day as the twelfth century of the Christian Era, we perceive that, every care was taken of, and great attention paid to, the education, attainments, and freedom of our women. For, we see Dr. Sir R. G. Bhândârkar writing as follows :—"There is, therefore, no doubt that Savaldevi was a married queen of Soma ; and if so, we have evidence here that in the last quarter of the twelfth century of the Christian Era, music and dancing formed a part of the education of Kshatriya girls, and that a married Kshatriya woman could be present at an assembly of eminent men, and sing before them without impropriety."

He further adds, "There is one remarkable circumstance concerning the grant before us, which deserves notice. It was at the instance of a woman that King Soma made the grant. In the audience-hall, where were assembled eminent and influential men of his and of other kingdoms, and persons proficient in the arts of music and dancing, and men of taste were gathered together, and instrumental music was going on, she sang a beautiful song in a most skilful manner, and obtained from the king, who

was very much pleased, as a reward, his consent to give the land in charity, and granted it herself on the occasion, but afterwards got the king to do so more formally in the usual manner." (*Vide* Dr. Sir R. G. Bhândárkar's Paper, read before the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, on the 30th July 1892).

I would here mention one more interesting illustration of still earlier times, of the freedom of ancient Hindu Society from the trammels of the system of female seclusion, introduced by the Mahomedans. Emperor Harsha (A.D 606-648) was very fond of listening to the exposition of rival doctors of divinity. On one occasion, the Emperor's widowed sister Râjyashrî had accompanied her brother Emperor, had sat by his side to hear the lecture of Hiuen Tsang—the Master of the Law, "and frankly expressed the pleasure which she received from the discourse. One Chinese authority even asserts that, Harsha administered the Government in conjunction with her" (Vincent A. Smith's *Early History of India*. pp 320, 321. Edition 1908).

Obviously, the chief end and aim of our Vedic and Post-Vedic polity having been the education of men and women of the country, as also the culture of our nation at large, our women, owing to their attainments, were, as a

matter of course, well treated, nay had secured due respect, enjoyed good freedom, and possessed great influence in all matters. Accordingly, Grant Duff, the historian of the Maratha Empire, has, from his personal knowledge and experience observed that, "The women in the Maratha country are well treated. They are the help-mates, but by no means the slaves, of their husbands; nor are they in the degraded state in which some travellers have described the condition of the women in other parts of India." (*Vide History of the Marathas*. Third Edition. 1873. p 8).

While the historian of Rajasthan emphatically writes that, "The influence of women on Rajpoot society is marked in every page of Hindu history, from the most remote periods. Like the magnetic power, however latent, their attraction is not the less certain." (*Vide Tod's Rajasthan*, vol i. pp 543, 523. Third Reprint. 1880). And Miss Florence Nightingale, in her Introduction to an English Edition of Beharamji, M. Malabari's Biographical Sketch, says, "Yet, the women of India possess influence the most unbounded. In their own house-holds, be it in hut or palace, even though never seen, they hold the most important moral strong-holds of any women on earth. Did not a well known Indian gentleman declare that it was

easier to defy the Secretary of State than to defy one's own mother-in-law? Supported by ancient custom, Indian women are absolute within their sphere."

Obviously, it was this moral influence of our mothers in a variety of ways, and in all conceivable matters, whether religious or social, educational or political, that had shaped, and have even now been shaping the character and lives of our eminent men, nay had produced saints from Nârada down to Shree Râma Krishna of Bengal, of the 19th Century, philosophers and metaphysicians, poets and dramatists, men of wonderful and commanding genius, novelists and fable-writers of high fame, persons of great originality and true research, Engineers *par-excellence*, Mathematicians, architects, discoverers, and inventors, as also sovereigns like Harischandra and Râmchandra, Chandragupta and Ashoka, Harsha and Shivâji, or statesmen like Châṇakya and Nânâ Fadnavis, Poornia and Sir T. Madhavrao, etc.;—a fact having been admitted even by Anglo-Indians, who are not generally disposed to admire Hindu talents and originality, I venture to give an extract from what they have observed in respect of this matter :—

"From time immemorial, India has been noted for her speculations in metaphysics. The

earlier philosophers and metaphysicians were men of the subtlest intellects. But, the Hindus were not simply excellent metaphysicians, they were excellent poets, excellent dramatists, and excellent fable-writers. As time went on, this nation that produced the *Upanishads* and the *Yoga*, and the Vedanta, also clothed the world with its wearing stuffs, fed the world with its food stuffs, and supplied it even with the luxuries in the shape of spices and condiments. This latter achievement must presuppose a considerable industrial aptitude; and that they had it, is further borne out by the fact, that not only was that marvellous construction of *Indraprastha* we read of in the *Maha-Bhârata*, brought into being by Hindu Engineers, but it was the Hindus¹ who supplied the rest of the world with the elements of Arithmetic and Algebra, and even Trigonometry, as Dr. Colenso tells us. They also anticipated our Newton in the discovery of the law of gravitation, predicted eclipses with great accuracy, and explained their celestial phenomena. The trade-guilds which they formed—which, later on, when the environment was changed, developed into the obnoxious caste-system, were at first designed to serve industrial purposes. (*Vide* also *supra pp* 343 @ 350).

¹ As to what Hindu means, please see *ante pp* 353, 354. Foot-note.

"Its good fruits we could mark in the hereditary manual skill, which alone could have achieved the wonders of a Taj Mahal in architecture, or could have produced that Dacca Muslin as a fabric—the whole web being so fine in texture, as to be capable of being passed through a finger's ring !—or could have produced that miniature painting as that of Delhi—that painting on ivory, the subtlety and clearness of which *we do not yet know how to account for*, as the result of mere 'unaided handiwork'. * * The system that had produced some of *the finest* warriors in the world—the Rajputs—was a system which had much to commend it."

"Its (India's) vitality has been everywhere acknowledged. *The very defiance of decay is its proof.*"

"There are already writers in India whose peculiarly Hindu intellect enables them to wield the English language, as Englishmen themselves would be proud to wield. There have already been Keshav Chandra Sen, and Joru Datt, and Sambhoo Chandra Mookerjee—a great religious thinker and orator, a great poetess, and a great journalist. There have already been archaeologists like Rajendralal Mitra, historians like Ramesha Chandra Datta, novelists like Bankim Chandra Chatterji, essayists like Ishvara Chandra Vidyasagar—all of whom men of European

standing. * * * Even in the domain of science, the Hindu intellect has already been achieving admirable results. That Lord Kolvin himself should have read with "wonder and admiration" Dr. Bose's researches in physics, and that the Royal Society is going to publish them in their philosophical Transactions, must be admitted as more than a sufficient testimony to their high merit. Dr. P. C. Roy's researches in chemistry have also found much favour in the scientific circles of Germany. Up to the time that Mr. Telang contributed to the Sacred Books of the East, and as recently as Dr. Bhândârkâr was elected a corresponding member of the French Institute, the Hindu intellect was believed to have achieved results which were thought to essentially belong to its genius. The achievements in science—on the original lines of investigation too, point to a new element in the Hindu intellect, which hitherto had remained unsuspected. Perhaps, the suitable environment has now definitely stimulated it. It is, at any rate, *undeniable* that the (Hindu) race must possess in its brain-material, elements to make scientists possible—no amount of mere training could achieve that result. The Hindu intellect is *not simply speculative and assimilative* as it has been *acknowledged to be*, but *it is inventive too*. It is in fact an intellect whose quality we should have judged by the tone of its civiliza-

tion. Hindu civilization has been the most adaptive of ancient civilization—for it has endured till now—and the Hindu intellect is therefore, perhaps *the most adaptive one in the world.*" (Vide *The Times of India*. Dated 11th July 1896. See also *supra pp* 118, 119, 274-284, in respect of the *originality* of the Hindus in all branches of learning).

Thus, it will be perceived that our polity has been the chief cause in forming the character of our mothers and women, and these in turn have principally been instrumental in bringing forth progeny and the race of heroes, of divines and sovereigns, poets and saints, Law givers and others, as described above. (*supra pp* 519, 520).

Lastly, I would advert to the remarks made by Mrs. Annie Besant, during her Presidential Address, delivered at the 32nd Session of the Indian National Congress on the 26th December 1917, to enable the Reader to compare the present state of our women with that of the past, and notice the awakening of them caused by surrounding circumstances. She observed, "The position of women in the ancient Aryan civilization was a very noble one. The great majority married, becoming, as Manu said, the Light of the Home: some took up the ascetic life, remained unmarried, and sought the knowledge of Brahman".

“Only in the last five or six generations, has the Indian woman slipped away from her place at her husbands’ side, and left him unhelped in his public life. Even now, they wield great influence over husband and son, but lack thorough knowledge to aid. Culture has never forsaken them, but the English education of their husbands and sons, and the neglect of Sanskrit and the Vernacular, have made a barrier between the culture of the husband and that of the wife, and have shut the women out from her old sympathy with the larger life of men. While the interests of the husband have widened, those of the wife have narrowed. The materialising of the husband has tended also, by reaction, to render the wife’s religion less broad and wise, and by throwing her on the family priest for guidance in religion, instead, as of old, on her husband, has made the religion entirely one of devotion; and lacking the strong stimulus of knowledge, it more easily slides down into superstition, into dependence on forms not understood.”

“The wish to save their sons from the materialising result of English education awoke keen sympathy among Indian mothers with the movement to make Hinduism an integral part of education. It was, perhaps, the first movement in modern days which aroused among

them, in all parts of India, a keen and living interest."

"Then the troubles of Indians outside India roused the ever quick sympathy of Indian women, and the attack in South Africa on the sacredness of Indian marriage drew large numbers of them out of their homes to protest against the wrong.

"The Partition of Bengal was bitterly resented by Bengali women and was another factor in the out-ward turning change. When the Editor of an Extremist newspaper was prosecuted for sedition, convicted and sentenced, 500 Bengali women went to his mother to show their sympathy, not by condolences, but by congratulations. Such was the feeling of the well-born women of Bengal.

"The Indentured Labour question, involving the dishonour of women, again moved them deeply, and even sent a deputation to the Viceroy composed of women."

"These were perhaps the chief outer causes ; but deep in the heart of India's daughters arose the Mother's voice, calling on them to help her to arise, and to be once more mistress in her own household. Indian woman, nursed on her old literature, with its wonderful ideals of womanly perfection, could not remain indifferent

to the great movement for India's Liberty. And during the last few years, the hidden fire long burning in their hearts, fire of love to Bhârâ-tamâtâ, fire of resentment against the lessened influence of the religion which they passionately love, instinctive dislike of the foreigner as ruling in their land, have caused a marvellous awakening".

All this is evidently the out-come of our Hindu polity, *moulded* as it has been by *our indigenous self-government, our religion and morals, our traditional culture and social environments*, yet, chiefly *influenced by the virtues of our women*, which have made *them* and their *husbands*, as also their *children*, what they have been. Very naturally enough, Sir Monier Williams describes these with much force and *pathos*. As such, therefore, I cannot resist the temptation to quote the Oriental scholar in full. Says he, "Children are *dutiful* to their parents, and submissive to their superior ; younger brothers are *respectful* to elder brother ; parents are fondly attached to their children, watchful over their interests, and ready to sacrifice themselves for their welfare ; wives are *loyal, devoted, and obedient* to their husbands, yet show much *independence* of character, and do not hesitate to express their own opinions ; husbands are *tenderly affectionate* towards their *wives*, and *treat them with respect and courtesy* ; daughters and

women generally are *virtuous* and modest, yet *spirited*, and when occasion requires, firm and courageous ; love and harmony *reign throughout the family circle*". (Vide *Indian Wisdom*. Edition 1875. pp. 438, 439. The Italics in the quotation are mine. *The Author*).

In connection with this, it will be interesting, for the sake of comparison, to bear in mind the subsequent remarks of Sir Monier Williams, as he observes parenthetically in a note thus :—
 " Contrast with the respectful tone of Hindu children towards their parents, the harsh manner in which Telemachus generally speaks to his mother. Filial respect and affection is quite as note-worthy a feature in the Hindu character now, as in ancient times. It is common for unmarried soldiers to stint themselves almost to starvation-point, that they may send home money to their aged parents.....In England and America, where national life is strongest, children are less respectful to their parents." p 438.
 It is to be regretted that *the strongest* national life in the West should ever come in the way of paying due respects to parents, or even in the way of parental affection.

The same scholar once more writes, " Indeed, Hindu wives are generally perfect patterns of conjugal fidelity," and " of the purity and simplicity of Hindu domestic manners in early times."

This indicates "a capacity in Hindu women for the discharge of the most sacred and important social duties." p 439. (*Indian Wisdom*).

Evidently, it is owing to these qualities that our women command respect, and have been described as *Gods and the very life itself*. (स्त्रियो देवाः । स्त्रियः प्राणाः ।). The latter expression, viz. the women having been *the very life itself*, though very concise, is very important and has a world of meaning in it. Because, they have been the source from where all men and women spring, and these shed lustre on their society, nation, and the country. Truly, has the great American Walt Whitman said, "Unfolded only out of the superbest woman of the Earth, is to come the superbest man of the Earth. Unfolded out of the justice of the woman, all justice is unfolded". This is *Shakti*, and the same has ever been preserved with a miser's care, simply because we have the highest regard for the *Shakti*.

The whole thing supremely reveals and brings prominently to our view the fact, that India is not dead, as some ignorantly suppose and would have us believe, and that *we Hindus are yet a living nation*, when other ancient nations are dead and gone (ante p 348). Nay, more than this, our nation is a *living power, a power to count upon*, and destined to play its part. It

has ever been creating love of our religion,¹ which is the *root-source* of our greatness, creating love of our culture, love of our civilization—the most ancient, and morally enforcing withal our ideas upon the world.

If the Reader thinks I have exaggerated facts, I would only give a few extracts from the mature thoughts and considerate speech of no less an eminent and erudite person than the Honourable Justice Sir John Woodroffe, in respect of the matter. Says he, “India is an idea. It is a particular *Shakti*, the Bhārata-Shakti, distinguished from all others by Her own peculiar nature and qualitiesThe basis

1 Says Max-Müller:—“ With them (*i. e.* the Hindus) first of all, religion was not only one interest by the side of many. It was the all absorbing interest; it embraced not only worship and prayer, but what we call philosophy—morality, law, and government,—all was pervaded by religion”. p 107.

“ Yet, among those ancient religions, (the Jewish, the Greek, the Roman, or the religions of the Teutonic, Slavonic, or Celtic tribes), we seldom know, what, after all, is the most important, their origin and their natural growth... And you will find that their period of growth has always passed, long before we know them, and that from the time we know them, all their changes are purely *metamorphic*—changes in form of substances ready at hand”. p 107.

“ It is this ancient Chapter in the history of the human mind which has been preserved to us in Indian Literature, while we look for it in vain in Greece, or Rome, or elsewhere”. p 109. (*India, What Can It Teach Us?* Edition 1883).

of all culture and the maker of all nationality is Religion. This is the root and trunk of the great Tree of Life....May the great and wonderful antique life of India be reborn in the forms of to-day ". (August 1917),

On another occasion Sir John Woodroffe had said, " This land (India) is not dead. On the contrary, it has survived all the great Empires, save that of China,¹ which were its contemporaries in past ages. Egypt, Persia, Babylon, Greece, and Rome live only in their influence upon the civilizations which succeeded them. India is yet alive though not fully awake to-day. It is precisely because it is a living force, that it provokes antagonism from those who dislike or fear its culture. Does any one now fume against, or ridicule the life and morals of Egypt or Babylon ? They and other past civilizations are left, as things which are dead and gone, to the scientific dissection of the cool historian. But, when touching India, even scholars cannot be impartial. Why ? Because, India is not the subject of mere academic talk, but is a living force. India is still feared where she is not loved. Why again ? Precisely because, she lives. Because, she is still potentially powerful to impose

1 *Vide* Western (i.e. Indian) Origin of Chinese Civilization (supra p 328. Footnotes l, m ; and pp 426, 427, 428 of my work *Âryâvartic Home and its Arctic Colonies.*)

her ideas upon the world. She is still an antagonist to be reckoned with in the conflict of cultures. Why has she, with her civilization so unique, so different from any other of East or West, been preserved? India lives because of the world-purpose, which she has to fulfil; because, the world will be enriched by what she can give to it. The Indian youth of to-day are the custodians of this treasure. Proud of their guardianship, let them cast aside false shame of themselves and of their own, as also all fear and sloth". (The Hon. Justice Sir John Woodroffe's Presidential Address, at the Sixth Anniversary Meeting of Friends' Union Club, 30th May 1916).

Thus, India's vitality has been duly acknowledged, and the very defiance of decay is its *strongest proof*. (supra pp 517-521).

To sum up. Missionaries, philanthropists, social reformers, and educational propagandists, having painted in dark colours the picture of Indian woman and her degradation, I have endeavoured to show the other side of the shield. Nay, even Mrs. Chapman has had to admit the fact that, "happily there is now a brighter side to the picture". While, that noble lady—the Marchioness of Dufferin and Ava would say with feelings of intense sympathy and admiration, as well as with even pride and pleasure,

that "so much talent, perseverance, and determination should be found, combined with so much gentleness, and with so many truly feminine qualities", in the Indian woman. (Vide Mrs. E. F. Chapin's *Sketches of Some Indian Women*. Edition 1891. Introduction and Preface).

Bearing in mind, therefore, all these facts, we naturally have a very high idea of, and even great regard for, the purity or conjugal fidelity, love of liberty or independence, of our mothers, sisters, and wives, as they materially contribute to the happiness of our Hindu Homes and domestic comforts. Truly, had our great Law-giver-Manu appreciated these virtues and other qualities of our women, and had, in right earnest, spontaneously given vent to the genuine feeling, which anticipated history, research, and science. In fact, the thoughts expressed by Manu are *a great Truth*, and would be found to be so, at all times, and in all climes. Said he, "A mother surpasses in value a thousand fathers." (सहस्रं तु पितृन्माता गौरवेणातिरिच्यते ॥ म० स्मृ० २. १३५).

Obviously, it would be but truism to say that our women have been enjoying freedom and influence—which is the fruit of our polity ; from hoary Vedic times, uptil now, as has

already been shown (*supra p 502 et seque*); and even our great Epic-the Mahá-Bhárata,¹ corroborates the fact in every way. We, however, find Manu imposing restriction on the freedom of our women. But, this is only applicable to cases where they lack the power of using discretion, and are unable to hold their own. (*Vide* the Code of Manu. V. 147, 148 ; ix.2, 3).

1 (a) अनादुलाः किल पुरा स्त्रिय आसन्...स्वतंत्राः. (म० भा० आदिपर्व).

(b) (नारी) स्वातंत्र्यमर्हति ॥ (म० भा० आदिपर्व).

अतस्तद्ब्रह्मार्पणमस्तु ।





INDEX.



A

- Abdur Rahiman (Justice).** 306, 344.
- Acton (Lord)** 293, 294.
- Admiralty—co-operation of in the Empire of Chandragupta).** 237.
- Admission by Anglo Indians and foreigners, in respect of our ancient Limited Monarchy.** 157, 272, 273, 328, 331.
- Ahalyâ Bâi Rânee.** 506, 507.
- Alyar C. N. K. Mr.** vii, viii.
- Akshamâlâ.** 499.
- Alexander (the Great).** 65, 161, 242, 461.
- Alfred** 333, 392, 393, 479.
- Algebra (Hindu).** 280, 281.
- Alotees.** 147.
- America—(Hindu discovery of)** 328.
- Anatomy (Hindu)** 280.
- Ancient document—the —most (in the world—Rig-Veda).** 111.
- Ancient India—Women honoured in.** 357.
- Andrews C. F. (Mr)** 293, 294.
- Angiras (Semi-divine patriarch of yore).** 46, 70.
- Angles (the pirates of the Danish & German Coasts)** 388, 389, 390, 391, 466.
- Anglo-Indians and their favourite argument** xii, 480.
- Anglo-Saxon life and polity.** 404, 405.
- Anglo-Saxon Slave-trade.** 419, 422.
- Animal magnetism, or mesmerism and hypnotism** 118, 119.
- Annie Besant (Mrs.)** xv, xvi, 102, 257, 261, 348, 521.
- Anstey (Mr. Chisolm).** xi, xv, 22, 97, 326.
- Ante-diluvian religion.** 100.
- Anti-Indian bias (prejudice).** 9.
- Aaron—brother of Moses.** 358.
- Aparârka—his commentary on Yājñavalkya Smṛiti.** 453.
- Appellate Court (Hindu).** 476.
- Apte (Principal)** 347.
- Arachosia.** 234, 462 (Tandahâr).
- Arangott Râjâ.** 188.
- Arbitration system (or Courts of, and decision by, Arbitrator)** 449, 452, 459,

470, 476.
Arctic (Hindu Colony). 374.
Argyl (Duke of). 303.
Aria. 462 (Herat).
Ariana. 234, 236, 462.
Arian peoples. 102.
Aristocratic Republics. 18.
Arithmetic (Hindu) 281.
Arjuna (advised by Lord Shree Krishna for securing the good will of the people) 216.
Army (Indian) 317, (compared).
Army (Japanes) 317,
Army (Russian). 317.
Arrian 159, 239 494.
Art (and Science) of Government, cultivated by Hindus. 243, 248, 251, 252, 282.
Arthashâtra. 67, 230, 251, —(antiquity of). 472.
Arundale G. S. (Mr.) 268.
Arundhati. 506.
Aryabhata. 281.
Aryan autochthones in India. 56.
Aryan Chief-invading and Conquering Egypt from Inida 355.
Aryan civilizations (interglacial) 101, 521.
Aryan Empire—unit of—the village) 146.
Aryan Institutions, &c., in India, earlier than any that survive beyond her borders 25.
Aryan nations. 56, 134, 145, 355.
Aryan peoples. (Hindus, the earliest of the). 349.
Aryan race. 40, 56, 101, 276, 277.
Aryan—chief motto of the—*Religion first and polity afterwards*—105, 527.
Ashoka. 233 242, 243, 253,

517.
Ashta Pradhân Scheme or system 176, 177, 178, 181.
Assemblies (कुलानि) 443, 449.
Assembly 48, 107, 108, 116, 122, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131, 132, 133, 136, 157, 172, 192, 253, (*of people, priests, &c.*) 254, 265, 273, 329.
Assessors. 195, 448. (Vide Jurors).
Atharva-Veda 80, 125, 126, 128, 129, 131, 132, 134, 141, 206, 207, 208.
Atharva Veda—times or period of—116, 125.
Athens' best days and loftiest intellects, not equalling those of India 495.
Atri—daughter of—in the foremost rank of women as a poetess. 502.
Attic tribes oro Inians. 359, 373, 374.
Austin (John)—and his Analysis of Law 381.
Autochthones (the Indo-Aryas) in Aryâvarta. 56, 89.
Autonomous (Hindu) Administration. 16.
Autonomy (Hindu) 282, 284, 325.
Avesta 101, 130,
Ayur-Veda 67.

B

Bâber-Mogul Emperor—regarded Hinduethan with dislike 487.
Baines (Mr. describes caste-system as the badge of Hinduism). 345.
Balfour (Mr. his mistaken notion about the governing capacities of Orientals)

- xiii, 17, 130, 270, 274, 285.
Bankim Chandra Chatterjee —a great Novelist-519.
Barth. M. calls caste-system as the religious factor of the highest order. 345.
Bayā-Bāi 220.
Behar incident, and Mr. Gandhi. 308, 309, 310, 311.
Bend the knee before East, 261.
Bengal (partition of). 202.
Besant (Mrs.) See **Annie Besant.**
Bhāndārkar Dr. Sir, R. G. (about the date of Mahā Bhārata) 213, (about freedom of Hindu women). 514.
Bhārata Varsha viii, xxii, 1, 36, 81, 82, 111, 118, 228, 265, 266, 286, 325, 376, 435, 436, 445, 460.
Bhārata Shak'ti, 526, 527.
Bhartrihari 218.
Bhavabhūti. 13, 211, 506.
Biot (Mr. his argument against Hindu origin of astronomy) 277.
Birdwood, Sir George 512.
Bishop of Madras' observation 314.
Bjornstjerna (Count). iv, 36, 89, 276.
Bleeding of India under Britain's rule, 489, 490.
Blood thicker than water, or more of tall talk, and less of deeds. 307.
Bloomfield (Professor) iii, 325, 412.
Bose. Dr. Researcher, in physics. 520.
Brāhmaṇa period, 281.
Brāhmaṇ Rulers, 263.
Brāhmaṇ superiority over the rest of the people, being poets, &c. 65, 346, 502, 502.
Brahma Sabha. 454.
Brāhmanical polity, 253, 255, 373.
Brāhmanic caste-system. 349, 350, 374, 376.
Brāhmanic colonies in Greece. 374.
Brāhmanic Constitutional Monarchy. 51.
Brāhmanism. 349.
Bright (Mr. John). 5, 5, 338.
Brihaspati (vide Smṛiti of)-
Bristol-Slave Markets of- 402, 419.
Britannia—what part so called. 387.
British Act of Parliament, imposing the worst conditions on Slaves. 424.
British Government of, or rule in, India compared with the Hindi Government of Hindusthān, and the British bleeding of India. 489, 490.
British Government's principle to make the Indian nation subservient to the interest of them—(the English). 336.
 —Its fatal defects. 337.
British occupation of Malabar. 186.
Britons, savages when conquered by Cæsar. 31.
Britons giving up, or selling themselves as slaves. 390, 401.
Buddhism. 155, 158, 161, 225, 293, 329.
Buddhist period. 18, 157, 158.
Buddhist records. 326.
Buddhist religion. 158, 326.
Buddhist times. 154.
Bühler (Professor). 218, 4.
Bureaucracy (irresponsible Government of the) 396, 302, 303; (foot-notes).

307, 308, 315-324, 335, 427, 428, 429.
Burk. 213, 214, 215.

C

Cæsar (Julius). 31, 386.
Cabral (instructed to spread Christianity by sword). 259.
Calrd. Sir James. 17, 150.
Caledonia. 387.
Calcut. 186, 187, 192,—Emporium of trade, and chief city.
Calpurnian Law. 474.
Capability of Indians for Self-Government. 315, 320, 322, 323, and admission of Lord Salisbury—484, (charges as to our unfitness refuted) pp. 479, 480.
Caste (Hindu—a name for trade) 21, (a larger organisation than the village community), 268.
Caste—antiquity of—349.
Caste—Institution had religious and Vedic sanction. 340.
Caste—reference to—in the Rig-Vedic 349.
Caste-system (of India). 226, 342, 344, 345, 347, 348, 350, 351, 373, 374, 518.
 —Self-acting 341.
 —A *tower* of strength. 348.
 —Its Sevenfold purpose 342, 343.
 —Its achievements. 346.
 —A powerful binding factor, 349.
Caste—the express Badge of Hinduism. 345.
 —representing the interest of every class and of the Nation. 349.
ste (in Egypt). 351.
Aste (or classes of people).

in England. 401.
Caste (or classes of people) in Greece. 351, 359, 372, 373.
Caste (or classes of people) in Rome. 351, 362, 363, 373.
Caucasus (Indian). 234.
Central power-India ruled by—before, a false idea. 18.
Ceylon. 254. (Queen of). 294, 474.
 —Itinerant Courts of—451,
 —Communal Courts of—452.
Chalukyas (Eastern). 166.
Champaran. 309, 310.
Chānskya. 229, 230, 233, 235, 237, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 251, 252, 253, 450, 472, 517.
Chandavarkar, Sir Narayan G. 227, 264, 268, 432.
Chandragupta (Maurya). 158, 159, 229, 230, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 251, 252, 436, 438, 462, 463, 472, 517.
Chandragupta Maurya—the first Indian Emperor. 234.
 —extent of the Empire of 462.
Chapman. Mrs. 529.
Charge (false) of selfishness, against Brāhmins. 229, 230.
Charters (India's two). 486.
Chatham (Lord) 416.
Chelmsford (Lord), Viceroy of India, and the Indenture system. 430.
Cherāman Perumāl, 188, 190, 191.
China. ii, iii, 16, 36, 328, 528.
Chola Administration. 197.
Chola kings (Emperors) 165, 167, 171, 196, 197, 274.
Chola Empire and the Jury

- System. 197, 459.
Chosen people of god—(Hindus) 73, 283.
Choubal. Hon. Sir Mahadevrao. 288, 306, 316, 442.
Christendom—deceptive allurements of—258.
Christian hard treatment of slaves. 341.
Christian Indian Government of 19th century. 337.
Christianity (oppression of)—257, 258, 259, 260.
Christian plantations (scenes of slave oppression and miseries) 341.
Christo—Moslem grinding Mill 262.
Citizen soldiership, 318.
Civilization (Indian) 31, 36, 37, 87, 90, 196, 199, 293;—(coloured the whole Soil of India) 294; *primitive* and *pristine*. 297, 298, 348, 376, 383, 497.
Civilization of India—a *living one*, 348.
 —the most ancient. ii, 298.
Civilization (Indian Origin of Babylonian). 325.
Civilization (Indian origin of Egyptian), 325.
Civilization (Indian origin of Grecian). 325.
Civilization (Indian Origin of Chinese)—328..
Civilized highly (the Indians). 297.
Civilizers of the world (Indians, the earliest) 298, 312.
Colebrook, 80, 277, 281.
Coleman (Mr.) 327.
Colenso (the Rt. Rev. Dr. John William). 281, 518.
Collier (Dr. W. Francis). 31.
Colonial Empire (Hindu), 460.
Committees (समिति). 443, 449.
Commons kept in subjection to the Crown and the Aristocracy. 414, 415.
Communal Courts. 474.
Commune of Village Representatives. 132.
Comorin Sea. 354.
Comparative Mythology (Hindu) 282.
Comparative philology (Hindu) 282.
Comparison of British rule in India with that of Hindi Rule in Hindusthan. 489.
Confidence—want of—and policy of distrust, 316, 317, 318, 319, 427.
Constitutional control, or check on the king, in Ancient India. 121.
Constitutional Government. iv, viii, xi, 38, 124, 176, 178, 179, 232, 330, 351, 377, 383.
Constitutional limits. 183, 272, 380, 493.
Constitutional (Monarchy) ix, 51, 71, 92, 99, 103, 109, 116, 135, 138, 147, 155, 175, 176, 177, 184, 252, 272, (Malabar) 274, 275, 282;—Vedic. 380, 493.
Constitutional Rule. 273.
Constitutional Sovereignty, 273.
Contempt (of Asia by foreigners). 4, 6, 7, 8, 29, 332.
Cooke Taylor—on Ancient History. 327, 352, 357, 358.
Corporate bodies (समिति) 443, 449.
Cotton. Sir Henry. 2, 4, 5, 9, 37, 39.
Council of Elders. 22, 96,

- 97, 98, 112, 113, 114, 121, 122, 123, 127, 138.
Council (of the King) 107, 108.
Council (of Representatives) 127, 132.
Court of appeal—the highest—476.
Courts of Justice (and duties of the different courts). 195, 450, 451, 452, 476.
Cousin (Victor). 261.
Cousins. 241.
Cowper—Poet—54, 283.
Cradle—of the Brāhman Religion, and high civilization of the Hindus—Āryāvarta. 36.
Cradle of the human race—India. 90.
Cromer (Lord—admitting extreme poverty of India). 482, 489.
Cruiser, a French Savant. 90.
Crusades—or the Wars of the Cross—were the means of acquainting Europe with the Jury System of India. 199, 471.
Cunninghom (Dr). 423.
Curtis (Mr). of the Round Table. 300, 301.
Curzon, A. (Mr). 353, 355, 356.

D

- Dacca Muslin**. 519.
Dādā Bhai Nawroji (Dr). xii, 289, 298, 302, 308, 311, 428, 480, 483, 485, 487, 489, (his speech at Kensington). 491.
Dādoji Kondadev. 230.
Damocles—(sword of)—261.
Dāsas. 74.
Dasharatha. 141, 142, 143, 210.

- Dāsharathi-Rāma** 356.
Dasyus (*irreligious*). 74.
Deccan. 242 (conquered by Bindusāra).
Degenerate State of morals and character of Britain. 402, 403, 404, 411, 413, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420; (admission by Lord Sydenham) 417; 423, 425, 426, 481.
 —of Greece and Rome 364.
Delbos (Monsier) 36, 37.
Delhi—miniature painting. 519.
Deliberate attempts of England, to destroy the liberty of other human beings 402, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433.
Demartilization (of India by England) 318.
Democracy (Hindu). 47, 48, 91, 155, 187, 192, 377, 383.
Democracy (Mahomedan). 440.
Democratic England 335.
Democratic Institutions. (*vide* Republican Institutions of India).
Deshaka Mahajar 455, 456.
Deshaka Sabhā. 454, 456; this was an appellate court, and superior to the Gota-Sabhā. 456.
Depressed Classes. 322.
Despotic Government (of India) by a free people 30.
Despotism of Despots in Greece 365—in Rome 367, 371, 372.
Dhanānanda (the 9th Nanda slain). 244.
Dhanur-Veda 67.
Dharma—Vedic—consisting in Yajnas. 106.

Dharma-Sabhā 454.
Dharma-Sūtras 446.
Dharmasthas 473.
Digby-William 5.
Dinkarrao Sir 38, 289.
Dlophantus (the first Greek Algebraist). 281.
Disabilities heaped on us, for showing our unfitness for *Self-Government*. 17, 291, 295, 300, 301, 302, 305, 306, 307, 309, 310, 311.
Disclosures of bribery, and abuses of Representation in England. 417.
Disgrace (at one time) to be called an Englishman. 467.
Distrust (of England in India). 316, 317, 318, 319.
Divine origin of kings. 381, 383.
Divine Origin of Sabhā (सभा) and Samiti (समिति). ix, 127, 329.
Division of labour (contemplated by the Hindu society and caste-system). 24, 339, 342, 344, 345, 350.
Dīvodās-Vedic King. i.
Drain (of wealth from India to England). 335, 336, 483, 484, 489.
Draper. 469.
Druids. 399, 400, 465.
Dufferin-Lady. 510, 529.
Dugald Stewart. 9.
Duncan. Mr. Jonathan. 190.
Durham (Lord) recommending *Self-Government* in the case of those who were thought to be unfit for it. 295, 296.

E

Earliest civilizers of the world (the Hindus) 298.

Eastern Countries and India the fountain-source of life of the West. 26, 27, 34.
Eastern Original (truly divine spirit of the)—viz India. 29.
Eastern usage—disintegration of—attributable to British dominion. 19, 20, 375.
East the parent of Municipalities 22, 97.
Education—test not essential, though useful in *Self-Government* 295, 296, 301, 302, 303, 304.
Egypt—wrongly thought to be the birth—place of European civilization 297, 477.
Egypt—the province of Aryāvarta 354, 460.
Egyptian civilization (and caste system) borrowed from the Hindus 352, 355, 357.
Egyptian Empire—Its founder having been a Hindu warrior—Manu, called Menes by the Egyptians. 353.
Egyptian—legislation (inspired by Manu) 3, 102.
Egyptian Nation—the oldest of the Western world 357.—and yet had its civilization and Institutions from Aryāvarta—older still. iv, 101, 102, 355, 356, 357.
Elders (Representatives of the village) 22, 47, 48, 50, 52, 92, 96, 97, 98, 107, 112, 113, 114, 121, 122, 127, 146, 187, 193.
Election of the, or electing a king (*vide* king of the People's choice). 135, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144,

146, 149, 151, 205, 206, 207, 208, 218, 378.
Elective franchise of, and election-rules made by, the Hindus 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 274.
Election of Members or Representatives. 165, 170.
Election Rules 165, 167, 171.
Elective principle 140, 141, 142, 143, 144.
Elphinstone. Lord 194, 195, 261, 274, 280, 281, 439, 444, 494, 495.
Emigrations from Bhârata-Varsha. 460.
Empire builder—Chânakya. 243.
Empire—desired, sought, and obtained by the Vedic Rishis. 117.
England—(defects in the system of the Government of)—*vide* evils of the system of British Government.
England held by the sword by Norman Conquerors. 407.
England (Its long rule in, and proportionately small benefit to, India). 319.
England—(the primary savage state of the natives of)—31, 385.
Englishmen trained and accustomed to dissimulation and despotism in India. 481.
English slaves from Britain put up to auction in Rome. 413.
Enslaved race (of England), Sympathised by the clergy. 467.
Epics (Sanskrit)—Antiquity of)—213, 446.
Epigraphic India. 175.

Equality—footing of—in society—a condition prior to the rise of sovereignty (or Government). 380, 382.
Equality of rights (of man). 383.
Estates—(three)—of the Realm. 330, 377, 383, 411, 412, 420, 478.
European mind—accustomed to a more limited horizon, and nurtured on Egypt and Greece. 14, 35, 43, 326, 327.
European monopoly of various forms of government. 331, 332, 384, 385.
European prejudice (bias). ii, iii, iv, v, 28, 42.
European races—the question of forms of government belonging entirely to—331, 384.
Europeans regard India with dislike. 487.
Europeans (not so white as painted). 337.
Eusebius. 32.
Evils of the system of British Government. 290, 291, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 323, 324, 335, 336, 337, 338, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 489, 491.
Evolution or origin of Sovereign-power or Sovereignty. 376, 377, 338, 379, 380, 381, 382, 378, 384.

F

Fiji (Islands). xiv, 385, 431,

Fiji planters and the immoral savagery. 432.
Filipines. 299, 317.
First or earliest civilisers of the world, 276, 298, 312.
First framers of our words—the Indo-Aryans—40.
Fitness for Self-Government (India's). 320, 336, 484.
Fleet. J. F. Dr. 251, 472.
Foreigners and Macedonian garrison driven out by Chandragupta Maurya. 235.
Forms of Government in India. viii, 332, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, (vide Schools of polity).
Freeman's Norman Conquest. 198, 470.
Forsyth's Trial by Jury. 198, 470.
Forward policy of modern England, compared with the dash of an Indian Emperor of ancient India. 234, 235.
Franchise—value of—not appreciated in England. 411.
Franchise—was in England—at the will and caprice of the sovereign. 411.
Frederic John Shore (Mr.), admitting the drain on, and poverty of, India. 335, 336.
Freedom—Hindu love of—xviii, 45, 54, 56, 85, 91, 180, 265.
Freemen (Greek) oppressed. 360, 364.
Freemen (Roman) oppressed. 363, 364.
French Revolution—Reign of Terror after the—335.

G

Gāndhī (father of Vishvā-mitra) 343.
Gāndhārva—Veda. 67.

Gāndhī (Mr). 308, 309, 310, 311, 434, 435.
Gautama Buddha. 158.
Gedrocia. 234.
Geometry (Hindu). 280.
Gibbon—the Historian. 29, 32, 325.
Gildas. 390.
Glacial Epoch. 100, 326, 327.
God-fashioned Region. 76.
Goethe. vii, xxii.
Gokhale. Hon. Mr. G. K. 288, 291, 315, 316, 317, 347, 425, 426, 427, 430.
Goldstucker (Dr). 261.
Gota Mahajar. 455.
Gota Sabhā. 454, 455, 456.
Government of India and England treating Public Opinion in India with contempt. 202, 318.
Grand-Jury. 456.
Grand Old Man (Mr. Dādā-Bhai Nowroji). 302.
Grant Duff (Mr). 149, 181, 516.
Great Britain 215, (had deprived India and others of life blood). 491.
Great Britain's slaves and its slave trade. 342, 402, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424.
Greece—the growing ill-feeling and oppression in—364.
Greece had no national form of Government. 366, 367.
Greek castes or classes. 351, 359, 372, 373.
Greek harsh treatment of slaves. 341, 342, 360.
Greek (Language). 8, 10, 11, 12, 278 (inferior to Sanskrit).
Greek legislation inspired by Mann. 3, 102.
Greek low regard for morals and breach of trust. 360,

- 361, 362.
Greek mines—(scenes of Slave oppression). 341.
Greek Nobles (or Aristocracy)—had the lion's share, and showed contempt for others. 359, 360, 364, 365, 366.
Greek polity in a nutshell. 365, 366, 367, 372, 373.
Grecian Society's lawless condition. 361, 362.
Greek Tyrants' rule or Despotie Manarchy, Aristocracy, Democracy, Oligarchy, &c. 365, 366, 367.
Grihya Sutras. 446.
Guilds (अग्र्यः). 443, 449.
Gupta Empire and Republican Governments. 18.
Gupta Emperors. 161.
Gurukula college. 347.

H

- Halbed** Mr. iv, 276, 325.
Hardinge (Lord) and His Majesty the King Emperor, unsettling the settled fact of Bengal-partition. 202.
Harischandra—King of Vedic fame—i, 517.
Harsha (Emperor). 161, 162, 163, 218, 515, 517.
Hastinapur. 145.
Hastings (Lord Warren—His favourable opinion about the Hindus). 440.
Haug—Dr. Martin—ii, 99, 349.
Hawkins. (Master—afterwards Sir John)—the first Englishman who sold negroes as slaves, 418.
Heaven (or Ind-Paradise) on Earth. 82.
Heaviest yoke is that of a stranger. 490.
Hebrew legislation. (inspired by Manu) 3, 102.

- Heeren**. Professor. 89.
Hellenic light. 297.
Hellenic civilization. 131.
Helot (s). 342, 360,—Massacre of—361, 362.
Hengist and Horsa. 389.
Henry iii, and the Pope—(the one asking permission to break the promise, the other giving consent to do so). 410.
Herbert Spencer and his Principles of Sociology. 382.
Hereditary culture and temperance of the Brāhmans. 346.
Heritage (invaluable)—received by our ancestors from Vedic Rishis—63.
Herodotus and the catalogue of Egyptian Kings. 352.
Highest type of Indian Mankind—the Brāhman. 346.
Hindu Capacity for Self-Government proved by the Vedic and Epic Empires of great extent, the Republican Governments, and the Governments of the Empire of Mauryas, Guptas, Harsha, Chhohan, Kānyakubja, Chola, Vijayanagar, Kerala, and the Marāthā sovereigns, iii, iv, v, viii-xii, xv, xvi, 45, 118, 121, 126, 141, 145, 154, 155, 156, 159, 161, 162, 171, 178, 187, 188, 192, 243, 246, 248, 252, 253, 264, 265, 272, 273, 282, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 299, 306, 320, 322, 323, 324, 339, 344, 346, 350, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 442, 443, 444, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457.

- 458, 459, 460, 462, 463, 470, 472, 473, 474, 476, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496.
- Hindu** capacity for Self-Government admitted. xv, xvi, 484.
- Hindu** children—dutiful to their parents, and submissive to their superior—524, 525.
- Hindu** civilization—Interglacial 101, 412, (*vide* Indo-Aryan civilization).
- Hindu** (Indian) civilization—iv; the most adaptive in the world, and has endured till now. 521.
- Hindu** College and others, conducted by Hindus. 347.
- Hindu** colonies in China. ii, iii, 328, 528.—in Egypt. 351, 352, 353.
- Hindu** discovery of America. 328.
- Hindu** domestic comforts. 530.
- Hindu** Dramatists, excellent. 518.
- Hindu** Empire. 451, 476, 492.
- Hindu** fable—writers—excellent. 518.
- Hindu** family life—admired by Mrs. Pichey Phipson, 510.
- Hindu** family life—picture.—Its happiness, conjugal fidelity, joys, and trials. 512.—the highest type of family life known, and inapproachable by any other nation. 513—love and harmony reigning throughout the—525.
- Hindu**—genesis and formation of the word—explained. 353, 354.
- Hindu** Government. 256, 260, 337.
- Hindu** Homes—happy, 509, 510, 530.
- Hindu** India. 373.
- Hindu** intellect—speculative, assimilative, inventive. 520.
- Hinduism**. 256, 257, 260, 262, 294, 348,—has given a common civilization for India, 293,—is an integral part of education. 522, 523.
- Hindu** Kush Mountains. 234.
- Hindu** Law—the oldest in pedigree of any known system of jurisprudence. 199, 470, 476.
- Hindu** Literature—the most ancient, the bulkiest, and the richest legacy. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15.
- Hindu** Manu was the Egyptian Menes—the Founder of the Hindu Empire in Egypt. 353.
- Hindu** Mathematicians. 281, 518.
- Hindu** Metaphysicians and philosophers. 518.
- Hindu** Mothers and children happy. 509, 510.
- Hindu** Nation—stood once at the top—3; was saved from conversion. 256.
- Hindu** Nation immensely civilized. 200.
- Hindu** Origin of the old Egyptian caste—system and Egyptian civilization, 353.
- Hindu** Originality, in all Sciences and Arts, Self-Government, patriotism, Astronomy, Medicine, Arithmetic, Algebra, Trigonometry, discovery of the law of gravitation, prediction of eclipses, weaving, architecture,

- miniature painting, art of fighting, &c, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 71, 73, 79, 83, 114, 115, 127, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 518, 519, 520, 521.
- Hindu** origin of the Caste system, or classes of people in Greece. 359.
- Hindu Poets**—excellent. 518.
- Hindu Polity** from Vedic times. iii, 339-357, 374-384, 412, 441, 443, (its fruits)—492, 524, 530.
- Hindu** purity of manners. 440, 513.
- Hindu Religion** 256, 257, (*the root-source of our greatness*). 527.
- Hindu Rule** in Egypt. 356.
- Hindus**—*a living Nation*. 348, 349.
- Hindu Self-Government** prior to that of Greece, Rome, England, or any other country. 406.
- Hindu Society**. 196, 223.
- Hindu Sovereignty** in India. 443, 453, 457.
- Hindu spirit** 294.
- Hindusthâna**—What does it connote and denote? 353, 354.
- Hindu System**. 198.
- Hindus**—wielding English language, as Englishmen themselves would be proud to wield. 519.
- Hindu**—wives and husbands happy. 509, 510.
- Hindu woman** in Vedic and post-Vedic times, her freedom, culture, and influence. 64, 65, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 506, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 522, 530.
- She astonishes Vedic Rishis by the depth and loftiness of her opinions. 64, 502.
- She is admitted by Manu to be the *light* of Home. 503, 521.
- She is nursed on her old literature 523.
- She is the perfect pattern of faithfulness, purity, and simplicity. 525.
- She commands respect, and is described as Goddess and the life itself. 526.
- her capacity for the discharge of the most sacred and important social duties 526.
- her conjugal fidelity 504, 530.
- her dislike of the foreigners ruling in her land, her independence, spirit, and virtues. 524, 525.
- her freedom 502, 507, 509, 514, 515, 516.
- her love of Bhârata-varsha. 524, of liberty and independence 524, 530.
- her magnetic power 500, 503.
- her patriotism 523, 524.
- her philosophical discussions 64, 502.
- her praises by श्रुति and स्मृति. 501, 503.
- her womanly perfection. 523.
- the desire of foreigners to do justice to her. 510.
- Hippocrates**—the docile disciple of the Hindus, in the Science of Medicine. 280,
- History** of the human mind, its evolution, and gradual development, found only

in the Vedas and in India. 87.
Hluen Tsang. 240, 515.
Hobbes—(and the idea of Government) 382.
Homer, and the law-less condition of Grecian society in his time. 361.
Home-rule neither given yet to Ireland, though England's kith and kin, nor to Indians, though a great people of ancient civilization, and capable of Self-Government. 335.
House of Commons and of Lords. (beginning of them in 1265). 409.
Hunter. Dr. Sir. W. W. xv, 24, 194, 256, 257, 258, 259, 345.
Hyksos—the shepherd kings. 353,
Hyndman 7.
Hyperboreans 36.
Hypnotism 118.
Hypocrisy (of Britain). 302, 307, 308, 486, 487, 488, (political). 489,

I

Ice-Age (Advent of—the Great) 374.
Iddesleigh (Lord) 337.
Ind-claims of—on the West.
Indenture-System, or Slavery in disguise, and its dismal tale. 425, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 487, 523.
Independence—National enjoyment of—in India. 53, 98, 178, 179.
Independence (Hindu love of) 265, 273, 524.
India feared, where she is not loved. 528.
India—not dead—but a living

nation—348, 349, 375, 526, 528, 529.
India—(ranked with the savage aborigines of the Fiji Islands and)—declared unfit for Self-Government, by Englishmen. xiv, 385.
India—the earliest civilizer of the world. iii, iv, 298, 476.
India—the most ancient country. iii, iv, 373.
Indian Art, Science, Civilization, &c. despised by some Europeans, on account of bias and ignorance. 42.
Indian Astronomy—Hindu origin of—277, 278.
 —Foreign origin of—refuted. 277, 278.
Indian Aryas of the antediluvian period, had preserved religion and culture from the general wreck. 100.
Indian colony in Greece 374.
Indian (Hindu) happy homes. 510.
Indian Institutions—Life-like representation of—in Chānākya's Arthashastra 250.
Indian Literature—immense, and bewildering v, vi, xx, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 29, 35, 40.
Indian Mothers—happy. 510.
Indian Nation—a living one. 348, 375, 526, 528.
Indian People. 7, 18, 179, 270, 304, 311, 313, 315, 320, 323, 324.
Indians—Not so black as painted. 337.
Indian wives—happy. 510.
India's Antiquity and high civilization. iii, xv, xx,

36, 37.

India's Industries destroyed by the British policy. 491.

India's knowledge of Self-Government vi, xiv, 16, 22, 25, 53, 60, 62, 71, 93, 96, 97, 98, 99, 108, 109, 112, 113, 114, 115, 122, 124, 127, 128, 129, 135, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 152, 155, 158, 159, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 168, (election—rules 172-175), 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 186, 187, 188, 192, 193, 194, 195, 200, 226, 227, 228, 233, 235, 236, 237, 238, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 253, 254, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 282, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 315, 320, 321, 322, 323, 325

India—(Hindu)—Type of the East. 373.

Indigenous Rulers, and the prosperity of India under them. 275, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, as also, Self-Government, Constitutional sway, and Government by representation xi.

Indo-Aryans (our Ancestors) 18, 23, 56, 105, 235, 270, 276, 285, 298, 332.

Indo-Aryan (or Hindu) civilization.—Tertiary-iv, 294, 297;—the most ancient 376.

Indo-Aryan polity—dubbed stereotyped uniformity of despotism. 333.

Indra, 57, 60, 74, 93, 110, 121, 132, 133, 349.

Indraprastha—A Marvellous construction by Hindu-

Engineers in the times of Mahā Bhārata. 518.

Indus—(Sindhu) 23, 75, 80, 234, 278, 279, 352, 462.

Industry Commission. 288.

Influence—foreign or strange, infection of—none on the Religion, language, or Vedic literature of India. 279.

Institutions of Ind—permanency thereof—376.

Intelligence Department of Chandragupta Maurya 239.

Interests of the nation guarded by the King. 122.

Invasions of England. 386, 388, 389, 391, 395, 397, 398; 401, 403.

Inveterate prejudice (bias). ii, vii, xiii, xvii, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 15, 32, 39, 40, 42, 43.

Inviolable decision of the Sabha. 129, 329.

Ionians or Attic tribes, and the four classes or divisions. 359, 373.

Ireland—(factions in)—292.

Irish (people) not granted Home rule yet. 335.

Irrigation system in the times of Chandragupta—Maurya. 240, 241, 242.

Ishvara Chandra Vidyāsāgara—a great Essayist—519.

Islamism. 256.

Islington. (Lord-His Commission). 306, 317.

Italy—the growing and heart-rending oppression of rule in—364.

Uthāsa and Purāṇas anterior to Vyāsa. 80.

Itinerant Courts, 449, 451, 476.

J

- Jacollot.** M. Louis. iii, 3, 28, 90, 102, 297 327, 460.
- Jambûdwîpa.** 228.
- Jaya Patras.** 455.
- Jesuits** thier oppression and allurements in the name of Christianity 250.
- Jolly** (Dr. J.). vide **Julius Jolly**.
- Jones** (Sir William). 10, 13, 27, 86, 194.
- Joru Datt**—a great Poetess. 519.
- Jules.** Peroche M. 205.
- Julius jolly.** 250, 476, 477.
- Jurors** (or Panchas). 195, 448, 449, 450, 453, 456, 457, 458, 459, (*Elders and respectable persons.* Vide *Dharmasthas*) 473, 495.
- Jury.** 196, 442, 468, (antiquity of) 471.
- Jury of Senators or Equites** in Rome (subsequent to the Hindu Jury, and yet a farce). 474, 475.
- Jury or the Panchayat System.** 159, 168, 181, 182, 195, 196, 197, 198, 264, 442, 443, 444, 445, 453, 454, 456, 458, 459, 463, 464, 465, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 478.
- Jury or Panchayat System** indigenous in India, and not foreign to the soil, but the prime source of the Institution. 444, 471, 472, 476.
- Jury system's antiquity and development in India.** 469, 471, (from before the Christian Era down to the first half of the 19th Century. 471.
- Jury System,** from Asia and through the Crusades. 199,

471.

- Jury or the Hindu Panchayat System,** put an end to, by British Government. 264, 471.
- Jury System**—English form. 445, 457.
- Jury System**—Hindu. 457, 458, 459.
- Jutes** (the pirates of the Danish and German coasts). 388, 389, 390, 391, 466.

K

- Kautilya** (a Brâhmana. Vide *Vishnugupta*). 244, 251, 252, 472.
- Kautilya's Arthashastra.** 230, 237, 239, 248, 249, 250, 251.
- Kern**—Dr. Maintains that the Caste-System of the Brahmans is as old as the Sun and the Moon 349.
- Keshav Chandra Sen**—a great religious thinker and O.ator. 519.
- King for the People** (Not the People for the King) 99, 137, 138, 152, 161, 164, 178, 184, 271, 379. (Ruler of the country and of the people) 493.
- King-maker**—Chânakya. 243, 251.
- King of Malabar**—description of the election of the —189.
- King of the choice of the people, or Elected King.** 51, 52, 99, 109, 113, 115, 116, 121, 122, 135, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, 151, 154, 161, 162, 164, 165, 188, 189, 190, 213, 271, 273, 493.
- King-ship**—establishment of—when ? 381.

- 36, 37.
- India's Industries** destroyed by the British policy. 491.
- India's knowledge of Self-Government** vi, xiv, 16, 22, 25, 53, 60, 62, 71, 93, 96, 97, 98, 99, 108, 109, 112, 113, 114, 115, 122, 124, 127, 128, 129, 135, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 152, 155, 158, 159, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 168, (election—rules 172-175), 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 186, 187, 188, 192, 193, 194, 195, 200, 226, 227, 228, 233, 235, 236, 237, 238, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 253, 254, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 282, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 315, 320, 321, 322, 323, 325
- India—(Hindu)—Type of the East.** 373.
- Indigenous Rulers, and the prosperity of India under them.** 275, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, as also, Self-Government, Constitutional way, and Government by representation xi.
- Indo-Aryans (our Ancestors)** 18, 23, 56, 105, 235, 270, 276, 285, 298, 332.
- Indo-Aryan (or Hindu) civilization.**—Tertiary—iv, 294, 297;—the most ancient 376.
- Indo-Aryan polity**—dubbed stereotyped uniformity of despotism. 333.
- Indra.** 57, 60, 74, 93, 110, 121, 132, 133, 349.
- Indraprastha**—A Marvellous construction by Hindu-Engineers in the times of Mahā Bhārata. 518.
- Indus—(Sindhu)** 23, 75, 80, 234, 278, 279, 352, 462.
- Industry Commission.** 288.
- Influence**—foreign or strange, infection of—none on the Religion, language, or Vedic literature of India. 279.
- Institutions of Ind**—permanency thereof—376.
- Intelligence Department of Chandragupta Maurya** 239.
- Interests of the nation guarded by the King.** 122.
- Invasions of England.** 386, 388, 389, 391, 395, 397, 398; 401, 403.
- Inveterate prejudice (bias).** ii, vii, xiii, xvii, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 15, 32, 39, 40, 42, 43.
- Inviolable decision of the Sabha.** 129, 329.
- Ionians or Attic tribes, and the four classes or divisions.** 359, 373.
- Ireland—(factions in)—**292.
- Irish (people) not granted Home rule yet.** 335.
- Irrigation system in the times of Chandragupta—Maurya.** 240, 241, 242.
- Ishvara Chandra Vidyāsāgara**—a great Essayist—519.
- Islāmism.** 256.
- Islington.** (Lord-His Commission). 306, 317.
- Italy**—the growing and heart-rending oppression of rule in—364.
- Itihāsa and Purānas anterior to Vyāsa.** 80.
- Itinerant Courts,** 449, 451, 476.

J

- Jacoffot.** M. Louis. iii, 3, 28, 90, 102, 297 327, 460.
- Jambûdwîpa.** 228.
- Jaya Patras.** 455.
- Jesuits** thier oppression and allurements in the name of Christianity 250.
- Jolly** (Dr. J.). vide **Julius Jolly**.
- Jones** (Sir William). 10, 13, 27, 86, 194.
- Joru Datt**—a great Poetess. 519.
- Jules.** Peroche M. 205.
- Julius jolly.** 250, 476, 477.
- Jurors** (or Panchas). 195, 448, 449, 450, 453, 456, 457, 458, 459, (*Elders and respectable persons.* Vide *Dharmasthas*) 473, 495.
- Jury.** 196, 442, 468, (antiquity of) 471.
- Jury of Senators or Equites** in Rome (subsequent to the Hindu Jury, and yet a farce). 474, 475.
- Jury or the Panchâyat System.** 159, 168, 181, 182, 195, 196, 197, 198, 264, 442, 443, 444, 445, 453, 454, 456, 458, 459, 463, 464, 465, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 478. -
- Jury or Panchâyat System** indigenous in India, and not foreign to the soil, but the prime source of the Institution. 444, 471, 472, 476.
- Jury system's antiquity and development in India.** 469, 471, (from before the Christian Era down to the first half of the 19th Century. 471.
- Jury System,** from Asia and through the Crusades. 199,

471.

- Jury or the Hindu Panchâyat System,** put an end to, by British Government. 264, 471.
- Jury System**—English form. 445, 457.
- Jury System**—Hindu. 457, 458, 459.
- Jutes** (the pirates of the Danish and German coasts). 388, 389, 390, 391, 466.

K

- Kautliya** (a Brâhmâna. Vide *Vishnugupta*). 244, 251, 252, 472.
- Kautliya's Arthashastra.** 230, 237, 239, 248, 249, 250, 251.
- Kern**—Dr. Maintains that the Caste-System of the Brahmans is as old as the Sun and the Moon 349.
- Keshav Chandra Sen**—a great religious thinker and O. a- tor. 519.
- King for the People** (Not the People for the King) 99, 137, 138, 152, 161, 164, 178, 189, 271, 379. (Ruler of the country and of the people) 493.
- King-maker**—Chânakya. 243, 251.
- King of Malabar**—description of the election of the —189.
- King of the choice of the people, or Elected King.** 51, 52, 99, 109, 113, 115, 116, 121, 122, 135, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, 151, 154, 161, 162, 164, 165, 188, 189, 190, 213, 271, 273, 493.
- King-ship**—establishment of—when ? 861.

King-ship—Evolution of—376.

King-ship—origin of—377.

King—the fountain-head of justice. 448.

King—the highest appellate authority 456.

Kollam Era. 188.

Kolvin (Lord). 520.

Kosala 156.

Koshâmbi 156.

Kottam (*Sans.* कोटक=An Assembly of Representatives). x, 155, 186, 187, 189, 192, 193.

Kshatriyas—Nayars—184, 231, 234, 339, 340, 349.

Kurukshetra—the Heaven on Earth. 82.

Kuttam (an Assembly of Nâd or County). x, *vide* Kottam.

L

Lacedaemonians—and their breach of trust. 362.

Land of the Seven Rivers. viii, xi, xii, xix, 44, 49, 56, 68, 73, 75, 76, 77, 80, 91, 127.

Land of liberty (England), and yet the Slave-trade was encouraged by it. 402, 418, 419, 420.

Lawrence. (Lord—admitting poverty of India) 482, (and scanty subsistence of India). 489.

Legacy—the richest-bequeathed by our Vedic Ancestors. 15.

Legislation—Egyptian, Hebrew, Greek, and Roman, inspired by Manu, iii, 3, 102.

Lepel Griffin. Sir—His views about the condition of English women. 513.

Liberty—Man's Birth-Right. 290.

Lilâvatî (Queen of Ceylon) 254.

Limited (King's authority). 116.

Limited Monarch 124, 155, 273, 328, 330, 301, 332, 333, 351, 378, 380, 383, 493.

Limited (King's power) by Hindu popular will or the Nation's wishes. 273, 328.

Literature (Sacred of Brâhmanas) 230, 331.

Living civilization (of India) at the present day xii, 348, 529.

Living nation still (India). xii, 348, 529.

Lloyd George xiv.

Local Self-Government (of India) iv, ix, x, 97, 166, 167, 168.

Locke—(and *Civil Government*) 382.

Logan. x, 185, 192, 193.

Love of Āryāvarta. 266.

Love of our country 54, 56, 68, 79, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 91.

Love of independence 266.

Love of liberty 54, 54, 56, 74, 91, 266.

Love of law and order 91.

Lusitanians—massacre of the—368.

Lycurgus. 333, 360, 365, 479.

Lytton (Lord) 300; (his confession about Britain's words without deeds) 302, 308, 486, 488, (and deliberate subterfuges) 489.

M

Macaulay. (Lord) xiv, xviii, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 30, 203,

- 275, 297, 314. (admitting England's oppression in India). 490, 491.
- Machiavelian strategems.** 246.
- Machichan.** Rev. Dr. 260, 348, 424, 432.
- Macdonell** (Professor). 448.
- Mackenzie** (Collections). 262.
- Madhavrao, Sir T.** 38, 289, 517.
- Madhavrao, V.P. (Mr.)** 320, 321, 322, 323.
- Madras—Bishop of—his views.** 314.
- Magadha Empire.** 229.
- Magna Charta.** 304, 408.
- Magnetism** (animal). 119.
- Mahâ-Bhârata.** 76, 80, 82, 87, 88, 145, 213, 215, 247, 277, 378, 380, 381, 446, 506, 518, 531.
- Mahâ-Bhârata Era—renowned King—Emperors of the—i.**
- Mahâ-Makham Day** (or Festival). 188, 189, 190.
- Mahâr. (A Balotedar).** 148.
- Mâhâ-Râshtra.** 177, 183, 222, 453, 459.
- Mahomedanism.** 256, 257, 260.
- Mahratta Empire, (Vide) Maratha Empire.**
- Maine—Sir Henry—3,** 19, 20, 21, 25, 30, 41, 42, 48, 97, 150, 275, 282, 297.
- Malabar.** 140, 184, 187, 188, 191, 192, 193, 274.
- Malabar Gazetteer,** 185, 186, 187, 189, 190, 191, 193, 375, 376, 470.
- Malayalis** (Malayali Nation). 184, 185, 190.
- Malcolm.** Sir John. 495, 507.
- Mallinâtha** ix.
- Mânava—Dharma—Shâstra.** 195, 446.
- Mâng. (A Balotedar).** 148.
- Manu—A ge of—194,** 446, (Foot-notes).
- Manu inspired Egyptian, Hebrew, Greek, and Roman legislation.** 3, 102.
- Manu—(the Code of—the Law-giver),** iii, 3, 21, 63, 76, 87, 89, 102, 145, 148, 149, 151, 152, 153, 194, 195, 198, 199, 200, 216, 217, 271, 272, 277, 343, 354, 356, 381, 443, 446, 448, 450, 476, 498, 503, 521, 530, 531,—his great maxim that “A mother surpasses in value a thousand fathers.” 530.
- Manu (King)—152,** 216, 356.
- Manu Vaivasvata.** 356.
- Maratha Empire** 179, 180, 181, 220, 222, 223, 230, 256, 263, 443, 456.
- Maratha Empire and the Jury or the Panchâyat system.** 181, 443, 456.
- Maratha Nation.** 84.
- Maratha navy.** 180.
- Maratha—Power—rise of the.** —456.
- Maratha Rule.** 457.
- Maratha Sovereignty.** 459.
- Maratha women and their freedom.** 516.
- Marathi Literature.** 83.
- Marris** (and Curtis, Messrs). 300.
- Martin—Mr. Montgomery—admitting the drain on, and poverty of, India,** 483.
- Mathematics** (Hindu) 280.
- Mathew Arnold.** 461.
- Matsya** (Purâna) 244.
- Maurya dynasty** 233, 243.
- Matha—system** 264.
- Maurya Emperor** 158, 233, 241, 242, 243.
- Max Muller** (Professor) vi,

8, 9, 11, 12, 23, 26, 34, 39, 40, 52, 65, 68, 86, 87, 90, 218, 219, 227, 230, 240, 276, 277, 278, 279, 282, 297, 327, 446, 447, 450, 453, 510, 511, 527.

Max Muller and Hindu Child—marriage, the wife's devotion to husband, and their blissful life. 511.

Mayne—John D. 199, 216, 469, 476.

Mayo (Lord)—admitting poverty of, and oppression in, India) 482, 490.

Mayûra (Poet Moropant) 199.

Mc Crindle 159, 238, 241, 462.

Meadows Taylor. 198, 200, 328.

Mediæval (Hindu) Empire. 16.

Mediæval Ind. 140.

Mediæval Period (Ages) 37, 123, 124.

Medicine (Hindu) 279, 280.

Megasthenes 159, 238, 240, 250, 341, 436, 438, 462, 463.

Mehta (Lady P. M.) 425.

Mehta (Sir P. M.) 316.

Menes 352, 353—Corruption of Hindu Manu (मनु), the founder of the Hindu-Empire in, and the first Ruler and Conqueror of, Egypt. 355, 356.

Merris—daughter of king Pharaoh of Egypt 357.

Mesmer 119.

Mesmerism. 118.

Meston. Sir James 300.

Metcalfe (Sir Charles) 98, 148, 267.

Methuselah 276.

Middle Ages 268.

Migrations of the Aryans—westward 355.

Mill (James) 42.

Mill (John Stuart) 301, 428.

Miniature Republics 97, 103, 122.

Minto-Morley Reforms 323.

Misrule (of England in India) 335, 336.

Mitâksharâ, the most authoritative work in Mahârâshtra, being a commentary by Vijnânesvar on Yâjñavalkya Smṛiti 453.

Mogal Empire—Struggle of the Mahrattas, against the—179.

Monier Williams (Sir) 13, 31, 34, 35, 43, 86, 257, 342, 524, 525.

Monothelism (Hindu) 279.

Monteagle (Lord) 308.

Moral degradation of Indians, under England's rule. 291.

Morley (Lord) 202, 323.

Morshhead L. F. (Mr.) 310.

Mosaic creation 276.

Moses. iv, 333, 357, 358, 359, 479.

Mote-Hall (Santhâgâra) 155, 157.

Mother-Country-affection for our-45.

Muir—(in respect of the Code of Manu). 149.

Mukteshvar and Patriotism. 83.

Municipal Boards 238, 463.

Municipalities. 22, 23.

Munro (Sir Hector) 185.

Munro (Sir Thomas) 227, 264, 463.

Music (Hindu) 279.

Mysore 38, 130, 261, 289.

Mysore Representative Assembly 329.

N

Nâd =(a county, or a congeries of *Taraz*). x, 186,

187, 192.
Nadia (Dist. of Bengal). 288.
Nânâ Fadnavis. 517.
Nandivarman 164.
Napoleon i., and **Shivaji the Great**. 177.
Nârada (Saint). 517.
Nârada (*vide* Smriti of).
Narasimha Varman ii. 164.
Narbadâ (Narmada). 236.
National Assemblies (of Vedic times). 44, 47, 48, 383.
National College. 347.
Natives (of Britain) had given themselves up to slavery. 390, 401, 402, 419.
Nâyâr—derivation of the word. 185.
Nâyâr polity. 192.
Nâyars, x, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 191, 192.
Nâyars (a pure Hindu and Kshatriya community). 184, 186.
Nâyâr. Sir Shankar. 288.
Negro—the Epithet given to the Hindu, or the Indian, by the English. 3.
Nineveh, 276, 327, 376.
Nirnaya Patras. 455.
Nightingale—Miss Florence. 509, 516.
Nivâdâ Patras 455.
"No Crime" a boob, and a spectacle of—in Ancient India. 156, 240, 438.
Norman conquest (of England) 196, 198, 465, 466, 467.
Normans—not French. 397.
Norman polity. 406, 407.
Norsemen 466.
Northbrook (Lord) 302, 308.
North-coote—Sir Stafford 337.
North-Sea pirates 466.
North-Western frontier,

secured by Chandragupta Maurya—for which England sighed in vain. 234.



Occident—the retreat of savages. 30, 34.
Ockley (Historian) 32, 33, 34, 86, 123, 275, 366.
Oldest book or document of the Aryan family—the *Rig Veda*. 111, 123.
One Nation-India—227, (*Vide* unity of India).
Oppression, corruption, rapacity, and greed of Britain in India, never known in any age or country, admitted. 490, 491.
Orient (the seat of Arts, simplicity, valour, and conquest) 30, 31, 337.
Origin of Government 377, 382.
Origin of King-ship, three-fold 378.
Origin of Sovereignty. 376, 381, 383.
Originators of the Socio-religious scheme, or the caste—system—the Brahmins. 345.
Oxford Provisions—evasion of them by King Henry iii of England. 410.



Panchas (*Vide* Jurors).
Pachâyats (*Vide* Jury).
Panch Vâri (पञ्चवारी) i. e. Committee of five. 166, 172.
Panchâyat System (*see* Jury System).
Parâshara (*vide* Smriti of).
Paradise on Earth-India. 82, 297.

- Paramars**—complete conversion of—by oppression 258.
- Parāntaka I** (the great Chola Emperor) 165, 166, 167, 168, 171, 175.
- Parshuram** Bhān Patwardhan 220, 221, 222, 223.
- Parliament** of king Henry viii of England, at his feet. 413, 467.
- Parliament** of England—confidence lost in the—414.
- Parliament** of England—relapse of the influence of the—413.
- Parliament** of India. x, 154, 155, 156, 157, 184, 192.
- Paropanisadal**. 234, 462, (Kabu').
- Paropanisos**—Indian Caucasus, and western frontier of Chandragupta's Empire. 234.
- Paternal** feelings for subjects, *only found* in indigenous rulers. 492.
—but not in foreign rulers. 486, 487, 489, 490, 492.
- Patnā** (Vide Pātāliputra).
- Patriarchal** family. 20, 46, 92.
- Patriarchal** rule. 46, 377, 383.
- Patricians**. 334.
—had the lion's share. 362, 364.
—and showed contempt for others. 363.
- Patriotism** (of the Hindus) and love of India 54, 56, 68, 71, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 91.
- Peasantry** of England little better than slaves. 468.
- Pedder** W.G. Mr. (admitting that the people of India are going from bad to worse under British rule) 482.
- Pentland** (Lord). 302.
- Peroche** M. Jule. (His views in respect of the Stone-Ago). 205.
- Perumals** (Emperors of Malabar). 188, 190, 191.
- Peshwā**. 178, 220, 222, 263, 444, 457.
- Pharisees**, 258.
- Philippians**, 298, 315.
- Philology** (Hindu). 281.
- Philosophy**, (Hindu), 279.
- Pichey** Phipson-Mrs. 510.
- Fictet**. A. 12.
- Picts** (and Scots). 397, 390, 403 466.
- Pioneer**—The—(Its confession about subtle disadvantages of foreign rule). 486.
- Pirates** of the North-Sea (or German and Danish coasts—the Jutes, Angles, and Saxons). 388, 389, 390.
- Plato**. 208, (disciple of Hindu philosophers) 461.
- Plebian** (s) 334, 342, 362,—deemed politically inferior—362.
- Pledges** of the Proclamation, —not fulfilled, 300.
- Pliny**, 237.
- Plutarch**, 237, 360.
- Pococke** (*India in Greece*), 327, 374.
- Polak** (Mr). 431.
- Political** institutions of India. 18, 48, 112, 131, 145, 267, 271.
- Politics** described in our Vedas, Epics, Smritis, &c. ix, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383.
- Polity** of England in respect of India, 335, 336, 337, 338, 415, F. Note.
- Poona** 262, 347.
- Poornd**. *vide* Purnia.
- Pope** and his advice to Henry iii, to break his promise to the nation. 410.

Popular Assembly. (*Sabhā*).
 iii, viii, ix, 16, 17, 44, 45,
 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 71, 72,
 92, 93, 94, 98, 99, 108, 112,
 113, 114, 115, 116, 121, 122,
 123, 125, 126, 127, 128,
 129, 135, 140, 141, 143,
 146, 152, 154, 155, 169,
 170, 177, 189, 265, 266,
 271, 273, 330, 350, 377,
 383.—the proto-type of
 English Parliament. viii.
Portuguese Christians, and
military aggression for
conversion. 257.
Post-Vedic and Vedic Em-
pire, claiming the three
Estates of the Realm. 330.
Power—in the Land of the
seven-Rivers—of the Sabhā
 and the *Samiti*. 127.
Power or Authority—desire
for, displayed by our Vedic
Ancestors.
Prajapati. 47, 266. His two
 daughters—the *Sabhā* and
 the *Samiti*. 127, 266.
Pre—Buddhistic times, and
King's election. 157.
Preceptor (Political—
Chānakya) of Emperor
Chandragupta. 246.
Preceptor (Spiritual, Rāma-
dāsa) of *Shivajee the Great*.
 231.
Prejudice caused by Ignor-
ance. 1-43.
Prerogatives inherent in
man. 379.
President of the Popular
Assembly had great res-
pect. 122, 125.
Press in India. Lord Macau-
 lay's ideas about it. xvii,
 xviii. 203.
Promises of Britain kept to
the ear and broken to the
hope. 302, 303, 308, 485.
Prosperity of (ancient) In-

dia, under indigenous
Rulers, proved by foreign
evidence. 258, 275, 494,
 495, 496.
Proto. Aryan language. 11.
Public Bodies (Assemblies)
 47, 48, 95, 103, 125, 130,
 146, 156, 232, 267.
Public Institutions of the
Vedic period. viii. 135.
Public opinion. xvi, xvii,
 xviii. 50, 51, 72, 99, 116,
 202, 203, 204, 205, 206,
 207, 208, 210, 211, 212,
 214, 215, 216, 217, 218,
 219, 222, 224, 248, 330.
Purānas (some genuine and
old). 80.
Purnia (State-man). 289, 517.
Purohita—the Brahmins—
dominating courts. 227.
Pythagoras (disciple of
Hindu philosophers). 461.

Q

Qualifications or attributes
of Kingship, 378, 382.
Queen Consort of Rāma, 507
Queen's Proclamation not
given effect to, 300.

R

Race prejudice and its ef-
fects xiii, xiv, xv, xvii,
 xviii, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10,
 15, 28, 29, 270, 285, 290,
 300, 305, 306, 307, 308,
 309, 310, 311, 315, 323,
 324, 487.
Ragozin Zenside. A. 111.
Rāja Mudrā, 456.
Rāja Rāja I Chola King, 166
Rajput (or the Aryan War-
rior Class), 24, 519
Rajendralal Mitra—an Ar-
chæologist, 519.
Rajput women, their influ-

- ence and happiness. 508, 516.
- Rāj**—*Salhā* 454.
- Rājyashri**—the sister of Emperor Harsha, attending Assembly. 515.
- Râma** (chandra). 141, 142, 143, 209, 210 (King-Emperor), 211, 212.
- Râmas**. 354, 356
- Râma Krishna-Shree-Saint**. 517.
- Râma Shâstri**. 221, 223.
- Ramasses**. 353, 355, 356.
- Râmâyana**. 141, 210, 506.
- Râmâyana Era**, and renowned King-Emperors. i.
- Râmadâsa** 83, 231.
- Ramesh Chandra Dutt**. 280, 288, 289, (an historian) 519.
- Rânade** the late Hon. Justice. 84, 85, 179, 223, 224, 262, 283.
- Ranga Charlu**. 289.
- Rape of Sabine women**. 368, 369, 371, of Lucretia. 368.
- Records of the Aryan branch of mankind**, the Vedas claim the first place in the row of the library of books of the world. 12.
- Registration of births and deaths**. 238, 239.
- Reign of Terror in France**. 335.
- Religion**—Hindu—has an all absorbing interest, and contains what other religions do not. 527.
- Religious Congress** (विद्य). iii, viii, Religious Constitution 265; *vide* Sacrificial Assembly.
- Remembered Traditions** (स्मृति). 443.
- Representation** (in India). viii, 92, 93, 94, 96, 135, 138, 351; *primitive mode of* 93, 94, 351.
- Representation in England**, an illusion, on account of abuses, bribery, and flagrant defects. 415, 416, 417.
- Representatives**. 142, 143, 144, 146, 218, 254, 307, 311, 329, 330.
- Representative Assemblies**. 332.
- Representative Bodies**. 71, 96, 97, 103, 113, 114, 130, 155.
- Representative Government**. ix, xi, 123, 140, 274, 325.
- Representative Institutions**. iv, 19, 38, 275, 328, 331.
- Representatives of different castes and creeds, professions and guilds, to form Panchayats**. 453, 454.
- Representatives of India from age to age—the Indo Aryans**. 40.
- Republican ideas** (borrowed from *Āryāvarta*). 326
- Republican Institutions**. ix, x, 152, 154, 156, 161, 166, 167, 326, 329, 331, 333.
- Republics or Republican States**. iv, 97, 98, 103, 122, 147, 148, 155, 156, 159, 161, 193, 328, 329, 331, 332; 333.
- Respectable men** (सभ्यः) to be Jurors or Panchas. 195, 443.
- Rhys Davids** (Professor). 18, 155, 156, 157, 255, 341, 437, 438.
- Ribhus**. 59, 73.
- Rights of man—our ancestors alive to the**—379.
- Rights of the people guarded**. 380.
- Rig**—Vedic civilization. iii, 64.
- Rig**—Vedic polity. 123, 204,

501.

Rig—Vedic Man pre-glacial and Tertiary: iv.**Rig**—Vedic woman's culture 64, 501, 502.**Rig Vedic** (Tertiary) Antiquity and culture. ii, iii, 157, 299.**Robertson** (Mr. John M. M. P.). his views on autonomy. 312.**Roman** classes or political divisions of the people into Patricians and Plebians. 351, 362, 363, 373.**Roman** (or Italian) harsh treatment of Slaves. 341, 342, 363.**Roman** legislation inspired by Manu. 3, 102.**Roman** law regard for morals. 364, 365, 368, 369, 370, 400.**Roman** Monarchy, Oligarchy, Republic, and Imperial Despotism. 367, 371, 372.**Roman** polity. 373.**Roman** (Religion). 279.**Roman** Republic. 327, (falsely named so). 334.**Roman** society—vicious State of—369, 370.**Romulus**—his revolting conduct in respect of Sabine women. 327, 367, 371.**Ronaldshay** (Lord). His views and ignorance about India's governing capacity. xiii, xiv.**Roth** (Dr. Rudolf). vi, 129.**Roy P. C.** Dr. Researcher in Chemistry 520.**Royle** Dr. 280.**Rule of Bureaucracy.** 323.**Ruler of the country** for the people 493.**Russian** Revolution for liberty. 335.

S

Sabha of divine origin. 127.**Sabine** women's rape by the Romans. 368, 369, 371.**Sacrificial** Assembly or Religious Congress (संघ). iii, viii, 47, 48, 92, 106, 107, 111, 112, 129, 135, 330, 350, 377.**Sallsbury** (Lord). 302, 308, 335, 337, 479, 489.**Sâmayâchârîka** Sutras. 446.**Sambhoo** Chandra Mookerjee—a great journalist 519.**Samiti** (the Village Community). 44, 93, 94, 95, 96, 112, 113, 114, 116, 123, 127, 132, 135, 265, 266, 271, 273, 330, 377, 383.**Samiti** of divine origin. 127.**Sarasvatî.** 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 89, 161.**Satraj** (Shutudri). 75.**Saxons**—pirates of the North-Sea). 388, 390, 391, 466.**Scandinavian** Viking. 40.**Scene of vitality**—the region of the river Sarasvatî 75.**Schools of polity in Ancient India**—(Local Self-Government, Representative Government, Patriarchal Government, Republican Government, Constitutional Monarchy, Limited Monarchy, Equality of Rights, Municipal Government, &c.). viii, 22, 23, 46, 47, 48, 92, 93, 97, 109, 129, 139, 246, 247, 248, 253, 254, 273, 351, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 384, 472, 473, 474, 476, 477, 478, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 506, 507, 514, 515, 516, 517, 524, 525, 526-531.**Scientific** frontier (of

- India) 234.
Scot (Sir Walter). 54, 56.
Scots. 10, 387, 466.
Sea-rovers (Pirates of the North Sea). 388, 391.
Seclusion, its origin. 508.
Self-dependence. 44, 45, 49, 51, 53, 60, 61, 63, 68, 74, 83, 85, 104, 125, 135, 138, 150, 153, 286.
Self-governing Bodies. 97, 135, 147.
Self-governing Committees. 181.
Self-governing faculty-(claims to) 313.
Self-governing Institutions. 193, 264, 311, 313, 374.
Self-governing Republics. 156.
Self-governing system. 171.
Self-governing Village Communes. 181.
Self-Government (*Vide* India's knowledge of Self-Government).
Self-Government (Nāyar's). x, 184.
Self-preservation 53, 57, 59.
Self-protection. 53, 57, 59.
Self-reliance. 48, 68, 91, 104, 125, 135, 150, 152, 153.
Self-restraint. 346, 347.
Self-rule. 315.
Self-sacrifice. 83, 84, 91, 229, 231, 232, 345, 347.
Shakti. *Vide* Bhārata Shakti.
Shivaji the Gr.at. 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 230, 231, 256, 262, 263, 265, 517.
Shore (Mr. Frederic John-admitting the drain on, and poverty of, India). 335, 336.
Shore. Sir John-(admitting evils of foreign rule) 482.
Shruti-(Origin of law in the). 265.
Sitā. 209, 210, 212.
Slavery common in England before, and accepted to get food. 390, 401, 402, 403, 467, 468.
Slaves (What persons)? 341, 359, 363, 390, 401, 402, 418, 421, 423.
Slaves (Anglo-Saxon Nation's two thirds were as such) 401.
Slaves (English, set free). 468.
Slaves (Britons selling or giving themselves as) 390, 401.
Slaves (importation and exportation of-on a large scale). 402.
Slaves. (India had none.) Nor Slave-trade). 341, 436.
Slave trade carried on by England. 335, 342, 402, 418, 419, 420, 422, 423, 424, 436.
Slaves-treatment of-by Christians. 341, 421, 423, 436.
 -(by England).-342, 418, 419, 420, 421, 423, 424.
 -(by Greece). 341, 342, 360, 361, 362, 365, 421.
 -(by Rome) 341, 342, 363, 364, 365, 421.
Slaves-(treatment of-by the Hindus). 341.
Smṛiti-antiquity of the roots of. 446, 447, 448, 453, 470.
Smṛiti Codes, or traditions. 443, 447.
Smṛiti of Brihaspati. 446, 448, 449, 451, 452, 476, 477.
Smṛiti of Manu-the authoritative Lawgiver. 446.
Smṛiti of Nārada. 443, 448, 449, 452, 476.
Smṛiti of Parāshara. 446.

Smṛiti of Yājñavalkya 446,
Smṛiti or Remembered Tradition—*roots of*—found in the Vedic ground, and this is the *prime source* of other Smṛitis, and the oldest of them all. 447, 448, 453.

Smṛiti—the word found in the Taittiriya Āraṇyaka. 447.

Soma king and his queen, in the Assembly. 514, 515.

Source of Vedic works—fuller, purer, and truer to its original character. vi, 52, 129, 130.

Sovereign—power in India of the Hindus, 45, 263, 264, 379.

Sovereignty—Evolution of—376, 381.

Sūtras—Age of the—446. antiquity of the—447.—Anupada—the earliest specimen of the kind of literature. 447. Nidāna-Sūtras 447.

Svarājya—in Hindu hands. 288.

Sword or Koran propaganda 256.

Sydenham (Lord). xiv, 301, 307, 310, 344.

System of Hindu Jurisprudence—the oldest. 199.

System of Representation, first in the East. 23, 47, 48, 50, 52, 93.

T

Tanjore Inscriptions. vi, 166.

Thales (disciple of Hindu philosophers). 461.

Thornton (Historian of India). iv, 101, 275, 325, 497.

Three Estates of the Realm,

or Empire. 330, 377, 383, 411, 412, 420, 478.

Tilak. Mr. Bāl Gangādhara. iii, 100, 103, 412.

Tirhut. 309, 310.

Tod—Colonel James. v, 4, 210, 213, 332, 461, 504, 507, 508.

Tols (or Brāhman Colleges). 347.

Traditions (past) of our governing capacity. 236, 287.

Travancore. 38, 187, 189, 289. Popular Assembly of—320, 321.

Trigonometry (Hindu). 280, 281.

U

Ukkal Inscriptions. vi, xiii, 16, 166, 168, 171.

Unfitness (of Indians) for Self-Government—a false insinuation for making capital out of it. 337, 385.

Union is strength. 95, 110, 115, 116, 494.

Unity of India. 266, 267, 268, 293, 294.

Unit of the Aryan Empire—the *Village*. 146.

Ushanas (a School of Politics). 247.

Uttara Mallur—Inscriptions. vi, 165, 167, 171, 172.

V

Valdik (Vedic) Literature, its immensity and importance. 11, 12, 13, 45, 52, 53.

Vain boast of some Westerners, in respect of forms of Government and love of liberty. 384, 385, 390, 401, 402. (See Empty

boast).

Vandalism. v.

Vedic Empire. 45, 118, 126, 330, 339, 377, 378, 383.

Vedic Literature. 11, 45, 74, 103, 137, 276, 278, 279, 446—Age of the—ii, 446. well defined three periods of the—446.

Vedic and post-Vedic period, peace in Ind—during—i, 49, 118, 120.

Vedic polity. iv, 103, 105, 113, 123, 124, 126, 127, 204, 282, 380, 501.

Vedic Religion (Primitive). 278, 279.

Vedic Source fuller, purer, truer. vi, 52, 129, 130,—(Unique) 12, 40, 87, 276, 297, 527.

Vidatha (विद्युत) vide Religious or Sacrificial Assembly or Congress. 47, 48, 92, 106, 112, 135, 253, 264, 265, 330, 377, 383.

Vijñāneshvara. 449, (flourished about Shaka Era 998). 453.

Village Administration. 165, 197, 232.

Village Assemblies. 166, 167, 196, 464

Village Community or Samiti. iii, viii, ix, xi, xii, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 72, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 122, 123, 125, 127, 129, 135, 146, 147, 148, 149, 151, 152, 159, 166, 265, 268, 271, 273, 330, 350, 377, 470.

Village Courts. 450, 476.

Village Elders. 48, 50, 92, 194.

Village Institutions. 17, 167.

Village Republics. 186, 193,

264.

Villages self-contained, self-governed, and self-organised. 156.

Village Self-Government. 165.

Village-system. 159, 265, (ग्रामसंस्था)

Villenage or Slavery in England. 467, 468 ; abolished. 468.

Vincent A. Smith. v, vii, viii, 161, 162, 164, 167, 197, 233, 234, 236, 238, 240, 242, 243, 255, 464.

Vishnugupta (also called Kautilya or Chānakya). 244, 251, 472.

Vishnu Purāna. 80, 81, 82.

Vishvāmītra Rishi a Kshatriya raised to Brāhmanhood. 343.

Vive-le roi 138, 492.

Voice of the people or nation. 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 212.

W

Wacha. D. E. (Hon. Mr.) xviii.

Wage of a labourer in India. —from two to three pence a day. 484.

Walt Whitman—a great American writer. 526.

Walter Scott. Sir. 2, 54, 56.

Ward. F. De. W. 258, 275, 495.

Wars of the Roses. 467.

Weber, (Professor). 64, 65, 66, 274, 277, 502.

Wedderburn. Sir W. 150.

Wellington. (Duke of). 291, 417.

West-children of the-barsh to parents and less respectful to them. 525.

West-kidnappings and slave-trade of the civilized—421, 436.

Western copy of Eastern Original. 29.

William Duke of Normandy. 396, 397, 398.

Will of the People or Nation. 51, 99, 248.

Will-power (of nation). 119, 478, 493.

Wilson H. H. 12, 42, 80.

Wingate Sir George.—his view of the cruel crushing by British rule, 336.

Wise (Dr). 279.

Witenagemot (or Assembly of the wise). 405.

Withdrawal of Roman garrison from Britain. 387.

Woman's influence in the East and West. 497, 513.

Women (Hindu) proud of

their standing, their family, and village. 439.

Women of India—possessing influence the most unbounded. 509, 516.

Woodroffe—the Hon. Justice Sir John.—527, 528, 529.

Wordsworth Dr. William.—316.

Y

Yajña patrns. 455.

Yâjñavalkya. 443, 446, 448, 453.

Yayati—Vedic King. i.

Yugas of the Hindus, and their antiquity. iv, 276.

Z

Zamorin. 189, 190, 191.

Errata Et Corrigenda.

Page.	Line.	For	Read.
viii	8	burried	buried
xiii	18	favourite	favourite
xv	31	wrough	wrought
25	27	desciple	disciple
47	10	genera	general
50	35	Cnommune	commune
62	3	भुरिदान्व	भूरिदान्व
71	21	littles	titles
81	10	existance	existence
88	27	एतद्देश प्रसूतस्य	एतद्देश प्रसूतस्य
101	4	anti-diluvian	ante-diluvian
102	5	boron	born
107	16	with	with
129	4	अतो नति-	अतोऽनति
147	17-18	self-contain	self-contained
167	24	histarion	historian
181	19	administative	administrative
189	13	p 164	Vol I. p 164
200	2	preceived	perceived
238	12	Magasthenes.	Megasthenes.
244	5	had	has

Page.	Line.	For	Read.
253	5-6	reigned snpreme	remained unimpaired.
261	3	gacat	great
300	27	11th	13th
316	28	seif-respect	self-respect
318	29	Gevrnment	Government
321	12	ceastainly	certainly
325	10	Ansty	Anstey
"	27	gauge	gauze,
367	10	p II.	p II. Vol xi.
386	6	cæsor	Cæsar
431	29	rushing	crushing.
453	28	Era 968	Era 998
463	17	it seems that our	our
476	18	John D. Maine	John D. Mayne
524	12	riligion	religion.